

THE EPISTLE
TO THE EPHESIANS

Donated by:


Chancery Office

3225 13th Avenue

Regina, Sask.



Campion College Library



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

THE EPISTLE
TO THE EPHESIANS

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF ISAIAH.

4s. 6d. net.

THE FIRST TWELVE CHAPTERS OF
ISAIAH. 3s. 6d. net.

SERMON COMPOSITION: A Method for
Students. 2s. 6d. net.

SERMON DELIVERY: A Method for Stu-
dents. 2s. 6d. net.

THE SONGS OF A CONVERT. 1s. net.

A PILGRIM OF ETERNITY. 1s. 6d.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS

AN ENCYCLICAL OF ST. PAUL

Translated from a revised Greek text and explained for English readers

BY THE REV.

George S. Hitchcock, D.D.,

Doctor of Sacred Scripture, Rome.

Burns and Oates, Ltd.,
28, Orchard Street,
London, W.

1913

Nihil obstat,

F. THOS. BERGH, O.S.B.,
Censor deputatus.

Imprimatur,

EDM. CAN: SURMONT,
Vic. Gen.

Westmonasterii die 16 Januarii, 1913.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE - - - - -	I
1. THE PRESENT INTEREST IN THE EPISTLE	
2. EARLY INTEREST IN THE EPISTLE	
3. THE WRITING OF THE EPISTLE	
4. THE ENCYCLICAL CHARACTER OF THE EPISTLE	
5. THE DELIVERY OF THE EPISTLE	
6. THE CHRONOLOGY	
7. THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM	
8. PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS	
 CHAPTER I. GOD'S DESIGN - - -	 48
1. 1, 2. THE SUPERScription	
1. 3. THE ASCRIPtion	
1. 4. ELEction	
1. 5, 6a. PREDESTINATION	
1. 6b. SANCTIFICATION	
1. 7. REDEMPTION	
1. 8, 9a. THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES	
1. 9b, 10. THE MESSIANIC PURPOSE	
1. 11, 12. THE MESSIANIC KINGDOM	
1. 13, 14. THE MESSIANIC INGATHERING OF THE GENTILES	
1. 15, 16. THE MESSIANIC OR CHRISTIAN SPIRIT	
1. 15. A DISPUTED READING, "THE LOVE"	
1. 17-19. THE FIRST PRAYER	
1. 17. THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD	
1. 18, a-c. GOD'S CALL	
1. 18, d, e. GOD'S POSSESSION	

	PAGE
I. 18, d.	A DISPUTED READING, " AND "
I. 19, 20.	GOD'S POWER
I. 20c.	A DISPUTED READING, " WHEN HE SEATED HIM "
I. 21, 22a, b.	THE CHRIST AND THE UNIVERSE
I. 22c, 23.	THE CHRIST AND THE CHURCH
 CHAPTER II.	 GOD'S WORK - - - 137
II. 1, 2.	THE GENTILES
II. 3.	THE JEWS
II. 4-7.	THE CHURCH
II. 8-10.	GRACE
II. 11, 12.	THE OLD TESTAMENT DISPENSATION
II. 13-18.	THE NEW TESTAMENT DISPENSATION
II. 19, 20.	FIGURES OF THE CHURCH
II. 21a.	A DISPUTED READING, " THE "
II. 21, 22.	THE FUTURE
 CHAPTER III.	 ST. PAUL'S MINISTRY - 222
III. 1-3b.	ST. PAUL'S COMMISSION
III. 3c, 4.	A PARENTHESIS WITHIN THE PARENTHESIS
III. 5-7.	THE PREACHING OF ST. PAUL
III. 8, 9.	THE PURPOSE OF ST. PAUL'S PREACHING
III. 8, 9.	DISPUTED READINGS, " IN," " ALL," " BY MEANS OF JESUS CHRIST "
III. 10, 11.	THE PURPOSE OF THE REVELATION
III. 12, 13.	THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE REVELATION
III. 14-19.	THE SECOND PRAYER
III. 14, 16, 19.	DISPUTED READINGS, " OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST," " MIGHT," " YOU UNTO "
III. 20, 21.	THE SECOND DOXOLOGY
 CHAPTER IV.	 LIFE IN THE CHURCH - 285
IV. 1-6.	THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH
IV. 6b.	A DISPUTED READING, " US "
IV. 7-11.	THE DIVERSITY OF GIFTS

	PAGE
IV. 7a, 8c, 9c. DISPUTED READINGS, "THE," "AND," "FIRST OF ALL"	
IV. 12-14. THE IDEAL OF THE CHURCH	
IV. 15, 16. THE CORPORATE LIFE OF THE CHURCH	
IV. 16e. A DISPUTED READING, "PART"	
IV. 17-19. THE OLD MAN	
IV. 17d. A DISPUTED READING, "REST OF"	
IV. 20-24. THE NEW MAN	
IV. 24. JUSTICE	
IV. 24. PIETY	
IV. 25-32. FIVE DUTIES TOWARDS OUR NEIGHBOUR	
IV. 28c. A DISPUTED READING, "HIS OWN"	
CHAPTER V. PERSONAL HOLINESS	- 381
V. 1-5. CHRISTIAN LOVE	
V. 2. DISPUTED READINGS, "YOU," "WHICH"	
V. 6-14. CHRISTIAN LIGHT	
V. 9. A DISPUTED READING, "LIGHT"	
V. 15-17. CHRISTIAN WISDOM	
V. 18-20. CHRISTIAN GLADNESS	
V. 21. CHRISTIAN SUBMISSION	
V. 22-33. THE SUBMISSION OF CHRISTIAN WIVES	
V. 30. A DISPUTED READING, "OUT OF HIS FLESH AND OUT OF HIS BONES"	
CHAPTER VI. PEACE AND WAR	- 460
VI. 1-4. THE SUBMISSION OF CHRISTIAN CHILDREN	
VI. 5-9. THE SUBMISSION OF CHRISTIAN SLAVES	
VI. 10-17. THE RESISTANCE OF THE CHRISTIAN WARRIOR	
VI. 16. DISPUTED READINGS, "IN," "THE"	
VI. 18-20. THE THIRD PRAYER	
VI. 21, 22. TYCHICUS	
VI. 23. THE APOSTOLIC BENEDICTION	
VI. 24. ST. PAUL'S POSTSCRIPT	
VI. 24. A DISPUTED READING, "AMEN"	
THE SUBSCRIPTION	

	PAGE
CONCLUSION - - - - -	517
THE ENCYCLICAL IN THE MODERN WORLD	
GENERAL INDEX - - - - -	533
INDEX OF IMPORTANT SCRIPTURE REFERENCES - - - - -	534

EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS

PREFACE

I. THE PRESENT INTEREST IN THE EPISTLE

When the nineteenth century recoiled from the individualism of the eighteenth, it found its natural expression in socialism, and its supernatural in the Catholic Revival. Although it did little to determine the harmonious interrelation of the individual conscience, the family, the local congregation, the local administration, the diocese, the nation, the State and the Church, yet the century, in spite of its unrestrained imagination and unrestrainable conceit, left that ultimate problem the richer for its labours.

Among those, who then laboured in obscurity, were the Plymouth Brethren. To speak calmly of their work, it is necessary that I should for a moment forget how much I owe to those, who influenced my life, when it was just passing from its almost pagan boyhood to man's estate. They lit the morning of my life with the idea of the Catholic Church ; and now in the afternoon, I may not limit their gift or my gratitude. To me, then looking for some meaning in the world, they came with their dream ; and of all the dreamers, who formed the pulse of that century, they were the most dreamful. Every Sunday morning, they gathered round a table, with its white cover, loaf of bread and pewter pot of wine. Though they had no instrumental

music, and indeed little music of any kind, their hearts expanded heavenward with united love of God and the Brotherhood.

Of the actual Catholic Church, they knew nothing ; but they were well acquainted with the Protestant communions. Both the Papacy and those denominations were condemned with the same implacable condemnation. I do not think the good people felt unkindly towards anyone or anything else in the world. But because they banned Rome and the sects till language failed, and left the seat of judgement to a more terrible silence, they stood apart from the Christian world as from a spiritual ruin. Romances and pamphlets, and still more the pained looks on gentle and motherly faces warned inquisitive youth against the Scarlet Woman. The more vehement and masterful, and at times even the more beautiful souls would relieve their feelings by some rude taunt against the Protestant churches and the Catholic Church.

It was a commonplace of theirs that the sects had failed ; and they protested against the sects, even to the extent of forming a new one. However scornfully they denied their own sectarian position, they had inherited all the features of a sect, and even split into smaller sects, ever more and more minute, till the disappointment of many promising lives became unspeakably pathetic.

Yet they cheered themselves with the picture of St. Paul in his Roman lodging. It said much for their own heroism that they found encouragement in such a scene. But heroism is of one kin ; and spiritual heroism tells its own family history in St. Paul, the Plymouth Brethren and the French Jesuits. In all of these, consecrated souls lived apart from wealth, pleasure and honour to wait on those commands, which are whispered to the light-armed volunteers alone in the cosmic battle.

While the world passed on, thoughtless and unimpressed by the preaching of the Plymouth Brethren, the ruin of the sects was repeated in the ruin of the Brotherhood. Even then, when there was no sympathy without and little hope within, the Old Guard, formed by the Exclusive Brethren, fed their failing strength with the writings of John Nelson Darby. An excellent clergyman of the Protestant Establishment in Ireland, he laid down his white surplice and black band, when the Dream took possession of his soul.

Out of the Epistle to the Ephesians came that Dream to him, but neither through the false gate of ivory nor through the true gate of horn. It answered the longing of his soul with its own pure light, dissipated by the prism of a sectarian education. Yet in his treasure, even as he saw it, there was the secret, little heeded by Protestantism, but involving the final order of the Universe. And though the new Samson was doomed to die, he would slay more at his death than in his life. The preaching of Moody would make the Brethren known wherever English was spoken; their name would introduce the works of Darby; and those works would point to that great epistle, which overlooks all local congregations to contemplate the Catholic Church of God.

Written on a strip of papyrus, about four feet in length and rolling up into a little bundle, ten inches long, the columns of the little scroll, like the *Apocalypse* of St. John, discern the purpose in the creation of the world, and foresee its fulfilment in the consummation of all things. At the beginning, God was gradually revealed, and the world was gradually formed, in preparation for the moment, when God said,

Gen. i. 26. We will make man in our image
According to our likeness.

Then the hinted mystery of the Three Persons was met by the three powers of the human soul. But between the Eternal God and the whole scale of being, from formless matter to man's reasonable soul, there is a chasm, vaster than that between nothing and matter, or that between matter and life, or that between a brute's soul and a man's. But the chasm will be bridged by the Incarnation of God and the Deification of Man.

As it is no egoist, but a social God, who will so unite Himself to a race, that is not atomic but social, the Incarnation will be wrought in such a way as to involve a multitude, made like Incarnate God to be His Temple, His Church, His Bride, His Body, Himself. So from formless Matter to immaterial Form, from pure passivity and inertia to pure energy and activity, from the lowest to the Highest, rises the vast scale of being, yet not in such an abstract or such an atomic mode as a pagan philosopher might imagine, but in the several ranks of the Universal Hierarchy with their manifold song of praise.

Such is the Dream, the true Dream and full Vision, which we need. It was therefore an understanding of our day that gave the interpreter Westcott, the scholar Abbott and the preacher Gore some of their life's work in the study of this epistle. Nor is it disrespectful towards them or their toil to say that they built better than they knew. As to others, who have lived and laboured in this apse of the Biblical Temple, none may suppose that I am slighting such Protestants as Armitage Robinson, Alford, Dale, Moule, Alexander, Wordsworth, Ellicott, and others of their kind. But I have chosen three as significant of what is hopeful in the Protestant world. Westcott's genius and his insight into the doctrine of the Incarnation, and Abbott's fearless and accurate scholarship, with Gore's romantic spirit and vivid imagination, are elements too active for sectarian

limits. Within the Catholic Church, they would be moulded and modified by many other influences, each of which claims due recognition and freedom for expansion. But in a world of parliamentary control and congregational trusts, their roots will eventually break the flower-pots.

To-day, the heart of the English world, wearied of so many controversies, may well turn with some relief to a letter, written without controversy by the prince of controversialists. And even those, who refuse an encyclical from the Rome of Pius X., may welcome an encyclical from the Rome of Nero. The parallel may be allowed us, though for a moment it assumes the encyclical character of the epistle.

Many similar features may be traced in the two scenes, the ancient and the modern. The imperialist spirit of to-day may explain, and itself in turn be explained by the imperialist spirit, which then reigned in Rome. The despotism of wealth in our modern world has a bloodless heart as pitiless as its bloodless hands; and in that very year, 61 A.D., in which St. Paul was dictating his encyclical in eager haste and at white heat, the despotism of wealth demanded the slaughter of four hundred slaves, because one had slain the master, the city-prefect. That same year saw the wrongs of Boadicea, her swift, short triumph, the fire of London, and the slaughter of 70,000 Romans, followed by that of 80,000 Britons and the fall of their nation before the Empire.

2. EARLY INTEREST IN THE EPISTLE

While St. Paul was dictating the encyclical, what the next three years would bring forth was happily hidden. And there was little to encourage those, who were dreaming on things to come, for Nero's five years of promise had

withered with his murder of his own mother in 59 A.D. In Palestine, there are already more than underground murmurs. Festus, the procurator of Judæa, has ordered the Jews to remove the wall, which they had raised to prevent Herod Agrippa II. from overlooking their temple courts from the new and higher story of his palace. But Festus dies now; and before Albinus will reach the province, the Jews of Jerusalem will stone the bishop, St. James, the Just and the Less, cousin of our Blessed Lord. In the autumn, St. Paul's trial will commence here in Rome. And his release will mark the beginning of 62 A.D., when Nero will lose the blunt and honest counsel of the Prætorian prefect, Afranius Burrhus, by death, and more cultured guidance by Seneca's fall. Indeed, at the present moment, Seneca's influence is insignificant, and the walls of Pompeii are displaying a caricature of Nero as a parrot, harnessed in a chariot, and driven by Seneca as a grasshopper, unless indeed the latter figure be intended for Locusta, the woman poisoner and agent of Nero; Monaco, *Le Musée national de Naples*, plate 16.

It has been customary to regard Burrhus as the custodian of St. Paul, but Mommsen's researches have found that official in the commandant of the Cælian camp, where officers on foreign service were lodged during their business in Rome. But we may gather from the epistle, which St. Paul will send off in a few months to the Philippian church, i. 13, that the Prætorian soldiers, who form the Imperial Guard, and the other people in the same neighbourhood, that is, on the north-east of the city outside the Colline gate by the present Via Nomentana, will have heard the Apostle's explanation of the Apostle's chain.

Not only so, but the same epistle, iv. 22, will justify us in inferring that even within the very palace of Nero, Christians may be found. Nor is there anything in the

salutation from those " of Cæsar's household," *Phil.* iv. 22, to limit such persons to palace slaves and freedmen. Indeed, four years ago, in 57 A.D., Plautius, the conqueror of Britain, was compelled to try his own wife, Pomponia Græcina, on a charge of foreign superstition. Though he acquitted her, the name of Christian will cling to her.

Still, a day of calamity is near for Rome and all the world, for both are delivered to a madman's caprice. Certainly, Nero will not be responsible for the earthquake at Pompeii, in 63 A.D., and only indirectly for the extortion of his procurator Albinus and the Jewish high-priest Annas. But in 64 A.D., to follow the chronology of Eusebius, *Chron. Olymp.* 210. 4, rather than that of Tacitus, *Annals*, xiv. 27, when the recipients of St. Paul's encyclical will shudder in the earthquake ruin of Laodicea, Colossæ and Hierapolis, the Fire of Rome will burn, until it is extinguished in Christian blood.

In that Neronian frenzy will be crucified a student of this epistle to the Ephesians. How closely St. Peter read it, and how clearly he understood it, are evident by comparing his own first encyclical of 63 A.D., with it. Not merely in words and expressions does St. Peter follow St. Paul. The invocation in *Eph.* i. 3, is the basis of that in *1 Pet.* i. 3. The form of *Eph.* i. 5-15 suggests that of *1 Pet.* i. 5-13; the matter of *Eph.* i. 18-20, that of *1 Pet.* i. 3-5; the " temple " metaphor in *Eph.* ii. 18-22, that in *1 Pet.* ii. 4-6; the exaltation of our Lord in *Eph.* i. 20-22, that in *1 Pet.* ii. 22; the relation of the prophets to their knowledge, according to *Eph.* iii. 5, 10, that according to *1 Pet.* i. 10-12; and the relation of the angels to the Catholic mystery, according to *Eph.* iii. 10, that according to *1 Pet.* i. 12. More remarkable still, St. Peter, iii. 18, speaks of our being introduced to God by Christ, as St. Paul, *Eph.* ii. 18, has shown the introduction of both Jews and Gentiles by

means of Christ in one spirit towards the Father. And some, but without sufficient reason, would explain St. Paul's reference to our Lord's descent, *Eph.* iv. 9, 10, by the preaching to the spirits in prison, *1 Pet.* iii. 18, 19.

So the encyclical of 63 A.D., will be impressed by the encyclical of 61 A.D. A generation later, in the year 95, the Pauline epistle will still be treasured in the Roman Church, and Pope Clement will use it in writing to the Corinthian Church. As it tells how God selected us in Jesus before the foundation of the world that we should be holy and blameless before Him, and how He pre-determined us unto Sonship by means of Jesus Christ unto Himself, i. 4, 5, so Clement will tell how God selected the Lord Jesus Christ and us by means of Him for a peculiar people, c. lxiv. St. Paul prays that the eyes of his hearers' hearts may be enlightened, i. 18; and Clement will tell how the eyes of their hearts were opened through Jesus Christ, c. xxxvi. The encyclical speaks of

- Eph.* iv. 4. One Body and one Spirit—
 According as you were called
 In one hope of your calling—
 5. One Lord, one faith, one baptism.
 6. One God and Father of all,
 Who is over all and through all and in all.

Clement will ask, "Have we not one God and one Christ? And is there not one Spirit of grace poured out upon us, and one calling in Christ?" c. xlvi. And it may well be that it was St. Paul's admonition to be subject to one another in fear of Christ, v. 21, which suggested Clement's "Let each be subject to his neighbour," c. xxxviii.

In that same year, 95, but on the island of Patmos, St. John, in his *Apocalypse*, will illustrate his knowledge of this Pauline epistle by his symbol of twelve foundation

stones with the names of the Twelve Apostles, *xxi. 14*, this being suggested by St. Paul's foundation of the apostles and prophets, *Eph. ii. 20*. He will tell how God announced glad tidings as to the Mystery to his own bondmen the prophets, *Apoc. x. 7*, as St. Paul tells how the mystery has been revealed to God's holy apostles and prophets, *Eph. iii. 5*. And beyond all such references, he will take the Pauline symbol of the Bride, *Eph. v. 25-32*, for the basis of his own great symbol in the *Apocalypse*, *xix, 7, 8, xxi. 2*.

At the very end of the century, about the year 100, when Pliny as consul is pronouncing his panegyric on the Emperor Trajan, St. John's study of the encyclical will bear fruit in some passages of his Gospel. Sometimes, it may suggest his own comment, and sometimes a Greek word to represent our Lord's Aramaic. It would be too much to say that the ten occurrences of the word *agapē*, "love," in the encyclical, led St. John to make it the dominant note in his Gospel. Certainly, our Lord's expression, "Thou didst love Me before the foundation of the world," *John xvii. 24*, does not owe anything to St. Paul's mention of us as chosen in Jesus before the foundation of the world, *Eph. i. 4*, and his subsequent description of our Lord as the "Loved One," *Eph. i. 6*. If there is any connection, it must be through a tradition, received by St. Paul before our Lord's words were recorded by St. John. Nor may we reasonably assume that St. Paul's direction, "Walk as children of light," *Eph. v. 8*, was the source of that, attributed to our Lord, "Walk while you have the light," *John xii. 35*.

But there are expressions, which show St. John's dependence on this *Epistle to the Ephesians*. For example, at the end of the Baptist's last testimony, St. John adds a comment, *iii. 31-36*, in the course of which he says, "For He does not give the Spirit by measure," *iii. 34*, that is, God

does not give the Spirit by measure to Christ. The full meaning of the sentence is apparent, when we recall how St. Paul had said, "But to each one of us was given the grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ," *Eph.* iv. 7. Earlier in the same chapter of his Gospel, St. John inserts another comment, iii. 16-21, and takes occasion to say, iii. 20, "For everyone, who practises worthless things, hates the light, and does not come to the light, in order that his deeds may not be exposed." Then St. John concludes his comment, iii. 21, "But he who does the truth, comes to the light in order that his works may be manifested." This owes at least something to St. Paul, who had forbidden his readers to have any fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather even to expose them, *Eph.* v. 11. And he had added, v. 13, that all things, "being exposed, are being manifested by the light, for everything, which is being manifested, is light." Among such instances, however, we may not count the connection between our Lord's work and our sanctification, found in *Eph.* v. 26 and in *John* xvii. 19. Nor do we find St. Paul's description of our Lord's descent into Hades and His ascent unto Heaven, *Eph.* iv. 9, 10, parallel to our Lord's indication of His own descent to earth and His ascent into Heaven, *John* iii. 13.

Twenty years later, in 115 A.D., just after St. Ignatius had passed through Smyrna on his way to martyrdom, St. Polycarp, the bishop of that city and the friend of St. John, wrote to the church at Philippi. In the course of the letter, he speaks of them as "knowing that you have been saved by grace, not of works, but by the will of God through Jesus Christ," c. i. The words are clearly a free citation of St. Paul's encyclical, *Eph.* ii. 8, 9, where we read, "For by grace you have been saved through faith, and that not of you. The gift is God's; not of works, in order that

no one may boast." And again St. Polycarp says, his words being preserved in the Latin version, c. xii, that he is blessed who remembers these scriptures, "Be ye angry and sin not" and "Let not the sun set on your wrath." As this sufficiently strange combination of *Psalm* iv. 4, in the Greek Vulgate with an adapted form of *Deut.* xxiv. 13, has already been made in the Pauline encyclical, *Eph.* iv. 26, we can hardly suppose it original in St. Polycarp.

St. Ignatius also had been influenced by the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, and employed it in his own letter of the same name. There we find not only words and phrases, but also sentences, evidently suggested by St. Paul's encyclical. For example, he tells his readers that they are stones of a Sanctuary, and were prepared for a building of God the Father, c. ix. And it seems he is recalling what the Apostle wrote of "every building, being conjoined" and growing "into a holy Sanctuary in [the] Lord," *Eph.* ii. 21. Then, as St. Paul had urged his readers to "become imitators of God," *Eph.* v. 1, so St. Ignatius addressed his as "being imitators of God." Nearer Rome and martyrdom, St. Ignatius writes from Alexandrian Troas to St. Polycarp, and through him, urges Christian husbands to love their wives as the Lord the Church, c. v. Those last words stand for these of St. Paul, "According as the Christ, the Church," *Eph.* v. 29. In his description of a Christian's armour, c. vi., St. Ignatius works out the details independently, but he may have owed the figure to St. Paul, *Eph.* vi. 13-18.

Mystics like Hermas, whose "Shepherd" we hold to be of the same period as St. Clement's *Epistle to the Corinthians*, St. John's *Apocalypse* and *Fourth Esdras*, that is, about 95 A.D., and speculative minds, such as the Gnostic Valentinus, who visited Rome in 140 A.D., read the encyclical, and delighted in it. Through the second century, a period for gathering traditions and completing organisations, the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, in its emphasis on consolidation

and unity, would appeal to the spirit of the time, and stay the decadence, almost inevitable after the intense life and splendid outburst of the first century. Toward the close of that second century, between 182 and 188 A.D., St. Irenaeus will quote *Eph.* v. 30, saying in his work *against Heresies*, V. ii. 3, "according as the blessed Paul says in the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, 'We are members of the Body, out of His Flesh and out of His Bones.' " And St. Clement of Alexandria, who will become head of the catechetical school there about 189, will say in his *Stromateis* or "Miscellanies," iv. 65, written before 202 A.D., "Wherefore also he writes in the [Epistle] to the Ephesians, 'Being subject to one another in fear of God,' " *Eph.* v. 21, the word "God" being substituted for "Christ."

In all succeeding ages, there have been men, who could in some measure appreciate this inexhaustible letter. St. Chrysostom stood in awe before its overflow of lofty thoughts. Erasmus recognised its Pauline fervour, depth, spirit and feeling. And Coleridge, in his *Table Talk*, confessed it one of the divinest compositions of man. Yet, even were it true of Plato's works, that they were written for ten men in each generation, no such statement could be made of this encyclical, for we, lesser men, fretted or despondent, learn endurance and courage from this brief letter, at once the product of an hour and the fruit of a life. For a moment, we may consider its human elements, apart from its divine inspiration and catholic authority; and regarding only that nature, on which grace built it, we see how an almost incredible courage faced an apparently invincible world.

3. THE WRITING OF THE EPISTLE

We leave the sultry heat of the market squares, and pass into the narrow streets and high houses, designed to exclude the glare, until we reach the house where St. Paul lodges.

We mount the stone stairs ; and at last, we find the room he rents. Though he is in free or military custody, he is subject to the continual presence of a soldier, whose left wrist is fastened to Paul's right by a light chain. In this same city, at this same time, the Spaniard Seneca,—Stoic, philosopher, Imperial minister and millionaire usurer,—can in his fifth epistle, write placidly enough of such a bond. That, however, is only one more illustration of Romeo's speech,

He jests at scars, who never felt a wound.

But the iron enters into the soul of the Semite Paul, and arouses now keen pain, now deep pathos, and now lofty heroism.

Many have tried to explain similarities of expression in the works of those two men ; and someone, apparently in the fourth century, forged a correspondence of fourteen letters in their names. It is true that St. Paul was brought before Seneca's brother, Gallio, at Corinth, in the autumn of 52 A.D., and Seneca, as Lightfoot, in his *Philippians*, p. 277, conjectures, may have been a Semite. But as Ramsay argues in his *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 354, and in his *Cities of St. Paul*, pp. 34, 222, the resemblances are due at least in part to the writings of Athenodorus, the Tarsian Stoic, who was the teacher and friend of Augustus from 45 to 15 B.C., and the chief person in the university and the city of Tarsus from 15 B.C. to 7 A.D.

As to the men, standing now by the door of St. Paul's lodging, one is a runaway slave, Onesimus, who has still managed to evade the police, and returns to his master, Philemon of Colossae, with the most perfect of personal letters to secure his pardon. Brief as that letter is, not a word is wanting. There is St. Paul's appeal to his friend's nobleness, his Christianity and his love for the writer.

There is even a promise to repay the master's loss as well as a pun on the slave's name, "Onesimus" or "Helpful," who had been unprofitable, but was now profitable both to Paul and Philemon.

Near Onesimus of Colossae is Tychicus, of Roman Asia and probably an Ephesian, who had shared the close of St. Paul's third missionary journey, and now bore an epistle to the Colossian church. In that letter, *Col.* ii. 1, St. Paul had spoken of his spiritual strife for his readers as well as for the Christians at Laodicea, and indeed for all those he had not met face to face. So Tychicus and Onesimus are waiting, for St. Paul, at the last moment, has determined to write an encyclical, which may be read in such congregations as well as in the most important city of Roman Asia, Ephesus.

Epaphras, denoted more formally by his fuller name Epaphroditus in *Phil.* ii. 25, also is standing by, having come by way of Philippi from Colossae, where he has been a leader and guide of the church as of the congregations in Laodicea and Hierapolis, *Col.* iv. 13. For Laodicea, Colossae and Hierapolis formed a small triangle in the Lycus Valley. Measured in English miles, the commercial city of Laodicea is little more than a hundred miles from Ephesus, six miles from the fashionable watering-place, Hierapolis, and eleven from Colossae, Hierapolis and Colossae being thirteen miles apart.

The report of Epaphras upon the Colossians and his own epistle to their church are still fermenting in St. Paul's mind, and will affect his present encyclical in great measure. But in his standpoint, the Apostle has now transcended the sphere of local congregations, and dictates with his eyes fixed on God's Eternal Design.

In the room, there is also the Thessalonian Aristarchus, who was seized in the silversmiths' riot at Ephesus, *Acts*

xix. 29, and afterwards accompanied the Apostle on his last journey to Jerusalem and to Rome. There too is the converted Gentile, Luke, or Lucanus, according to his Latin and real name, and to be distinguished from Lucius of Antioch, *Acts* xiii, 1, although the two have been confused by Eusebius, in his *History*, iii. 4, written between 305 and 325 A.D., by St. Jerome, in his treatise *on Famous Men*, in 392 A.D., and by the Alexandrian Euthalius, *Migne's Greek Fathers*, lxxxv. 63, in 458 A.D. Beloved physician, he attended St. Paul at Troas, and then stayed with the infant church at Philippi, probably his native place, till St. Paul returned. During the Apostle's imprisonment, Luke will still be with him, and Luke alone, in one dark hour of the second imprisonment, 2 *Tim.* iv. 11. In that time, the faithfulness of Demas will be tested to breaking point. At the present moment, he is standing by Luke, and still holds his place among the heroes, who are planning, and will accomplish the chief revolution in all history.

Besides the three Asiatics, Tychicus, Onesimus and Epaphras, and the three Europeans, among whom we may possibly include Demas as well as Luke and Aristarchus, there are three others.

Chief of these is Timothy, timid and delicate, yet destined to heavy responsibility. Early next year, he must go to Philippi, *Phil.* ii. 19; and in the east, he will be joined by St. Paul, after the Apostle's release and visit to Spain. Then he will be charged with the bishopric of Ephesus, till St. Paul is again arrested, and summons him to return with Mark to Rome. The son of a Greek father and a pious Jewess, a child of the Galatian church and circumcised by St. Paul, a native of Lystra and steeped from boyhood in the Old Testament, he presented many facets to the world. Though such a man could hardly be a type of

strength, he would succeed by affection and gentleness, as he twined himself round the great heart of Paul, and upheld the persecuted Thessalonians, when he was but a youth.

There is also Mark, preparing to set out for Roman Asia, *Col.* iv. 10. Of him we know much, and may infer a great deal more. But at the present moment, we are especially concerned with him as a companion of St. Paul. In 48, he left the Apostle at Pamphylian Perga, and returned home to Jerusalem. On that account, St. Paul, in 50, refused him as a partner of his second missionary journey. Now, in 61, he counts him a fellow-worker, *Col.* iv. 11; and in 66, he will acknowledge his usefulness in ministering, *2 Tim.* iv. 11.

Of the third, Jesus or Joshua the Just, we know nothing, except that he had worked for God's kingdom, and comforted Paul's heart, *Col.* iv. 11.

The presence of St. Mark and St. Luke is suggestive. Early next year, 62, St. Paul will be released, Christianity being therefore implicitly declared a "lawful religion." St. Luke will write out the *Acts of the Apostles*, concluding with a note that St. Paul, during his Roman imprisonment, was not forbidden to preach. Now the *Acts* was written a little after the publication of St. Luke's Gospel. Therefore at this time, St. Luke had written his Gospel, probably during St. Paul's Caesarean imprisonment, 57-59, which gave St. Luke the opportunity of collecting material for both his works from the Apostles in Jerusalem and from St. Philip the deacon at Caesarea, *Acts* xxi. 8, viii. 26. But St. Luke's Gospel utilises much of St. Mark's, as we see by comparing the series, *Luke* iv. 31-vi. 19, viii. 4-ix. 17, ix. 18-50, xviii. 15-43 and xix. 29-xxiv. 8, with the corresponding series, *Mark* i. 21-iii. 19, iv. 1-vi. 44, viii. 27-ix. 40, x. 13-52 and xi. 1-xvi. 8. Consequently, both men,

standing here by St. Paul, have already written their *Gospels*.

As to St. Paul himself, he is dictating in spite of weariness and headache. Weak with recurrent fever, worn with continual toil, and stiff with old wounds, he still speaks, the consecrated genius of his spirit consuming itself with passionate thirst for God and passionate hunger for souls. And as he proceeds, the Catholic doctrine enlightens the mind, the Catholic moral inspires the will, and the Catholic mysticism lifts mind and will to union and communion with God.

Four years ago, in 57 A.D., he had sat down in Gaius' house at Corinth to write an account of his fundamental doctrine. Then he gave the Roman Christians his great treatise on justification. But there remained other heights even in this life. To these, the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, vi. 1, 2, will urge its readers, saying,

Heb. vi. 1. Wherefore, when we have left the word of
the beginning [that is, the elementary
account] of the Christ,

Let us be borne toward perfection,
Not laying again a foundation
Of repentance from dead works
And of faith toward God—

2. As to a doctrine of baptisms
And of imposition of hands,
Of resurrection of dead men,
And of eternal judgement.

So the Apostle now unfolds the Eternal Purpose of God, the eternal significance of the Universal Church, and the eternal activity of souls at one with God, their Creator, their Life and their Goal. And in the centre of God's Universal Empire, Jesus, Incarnate God, is enthroned as Head of all Creation and especially of the Church.

4. THE ENCYCLICAL CHARACTER OF THE EPISTLE

It will be noticed that St. Paul does not unite St. Timothy's name with his own in the superscription to this epistle, though he has just done so in writing to Philemon and to the Colossian church. In both those letters, but not here, there are salutations from the friends around him. But now he writes that he has "heard of the faith among you," i. 15, and introduces himself as "Paul, the prisoner of the Christ, Jesus, on behalf of you, the nations—," adding these words, hardly significant of personal acquaintance, "if at least you heard of the stewardship of the grace of God, which [grace] was given me [with regard] unto you," iii. 1, 2.

It is difficult to suppose that St. Paul was writing only to those Ephesian Christians, among whom he had laboured from October, 53, to January, 56, that is, three years, counting the fraction in Jewish fashion as a whole year. Five years and a half ago, he left them in the whirlwind of the silversmiths' riot. Indeed, it was just four years ago, on Saturday, April 30, 57, he addressed their elders at Miletus, and then parted from them in tears. And there are strange connecting links between the words that then fell, and those that are now falling from his lips. In both, he speaks of God's counsel. In both, he tells how the Holy Ghost cherishes the Catholic Church. And in both, he points to the inheritance of the sanctified. Some of the expressions too form a bond between the two great utterances. If at Miletus, he employed the phrase, "with all humility," *Acts* xx. 19, he now at Rome once more, and only once more, employs it, *Eph.* iv. 2. On the former occasion, he spoke of God's "counsel," *boulē*, *Acts* xx. 27; and now, for the only time in all his epistles, *Eph.* i. 11, he so names the Eternal Purpose. Then, he commended

his hearers to Him, who is able to build them up, *Acts* xx. 32; and still reflecting on the power of God, he ascribes glory "to Him, who is able to do above all things—[more] superabundantly than [those things], which we ask or understand—," *Eph.* iii. 20. As in the earlier time, he had told them of the inheritance among all those, who have been sanctified, *Acts* xx. 32, he now prays that they "may know what is the hope of His calling—what the wealth of the glory of His possession in the holy [ones]," *Eph.* i. 18.

That connection between St. Paul's address to the Ephesian elders at Miletus in 57, and his epistle to the Ephesian church from Rome in 61, finds a parallel in the connection between that same epistle and the epistle of St. Ignatius to the same Ephesians from Smyrna in 115. Therefore, we gather that Syrian Antioch, of which St. Ignatius was bishop, and Smyrna, of which his friend and St. John's, St. Polycarp, was bishop, regarded this Pauline epistle, for all its contrary appearances, as written to the Ephesian church. Certainly, St. Ignatius quotes it to that church in a significant manner. St. Paul referred to "a stewardship of the fulness of the seasons," *Eph.* i. 10, and to the doctrine of "the fresh man," *Eph.* iv. 24. St. Ignatius, in his *Epistle to the Ephesians*, xx. 1, proposes to write in a second scroll about the "stewardship with a view unto the fresh man, Jesus Christ." The Apostle wrote, "You also are being built together unto a dwelling-place of God in [the] Spirit," *Eph.* ii. 22. This takes form under the pen of Ignatius, as "being stones of a sanctuary, which have been prepared beforehand unto a building of God, [the] Father," ix. 1. As St. Paul prayed that "the Christ might dwell by means of faith in your hearts," *Eph.* iii. 17, so St. Ignatius appeals to them, saying, "Let us therefore do all things, as He is dwelling in us," xv. 3. St. Paul reminded them that they had been called in one

hope of their calling, and that there was one Lord, one faith, one baptism, *Eph.* iv. 4, 5. Now, St. Ignatius bids them assemble in one faith and one Jesus Christ, xx. Finally, St. Paul spoke of the Church's wrestling with principedoms, authorities, rulers of this dark world, and spiritual [hosts] of evil in the heavenlies, *Eph.* vi. 12. And St. Ignatius tells of peace, in which every war of heavenlies and earthlies is being abolished, xiii.

This double aspect of the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, under one of which it appears intended for the Ephesians, the other being apparently inconsistent with such a purpose, meets us again in early copies and early writers. All the translations have the words, "in Ephesus," in *Eph.* i. 1. Ephraem, the Syrian, who died in 373, omits the phrase in his commentary, but he also omits "in Colossae," in commenting on *Col.* i. 2. The Old Latin version certainly read "in Ephesus"; and the doubts suggested in its regard are removed by reading the text, as it is given by Ambrosiaster, who was probably the Roman Faustinus, and flourished in Rome under Pope Dámasus, 366-384, his words being found in the "Old Edition" of *St. Ambrose*. This evidence is confirmed by the passage in the commentary of Victorinus, who lived at Rome about 360, and is presented in Mai's *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio*, or "New Collection of Old Writers," iii. 87. And the testimony to the presence of the phrase "in Ephesus" in the Old Latin version is made sure by a paragraph in the commentary of Pelagius, who began to disseminate his heresy at Rome in 405. The commentary of Pelagius may be found in Vallarsi's edition of *St. Jerome*, XI. iii., and was a source for the reading in Sedulius Scotus, who flourished about 818, Migne's *Latin Fathers*, ciii. 795, and for that in the commentary on St. Paul, wrongly ascribed to Primasius, *edition of 1537*, p. 333.

Further, the phrase is found in all the manuscripts but three. Of the three, one, the cursive 67, originally contained it, when the copy was made in the eleventh century, between 1064 and 1068. But at a later time and possibly under the influence of the Vatican manuscript, some one corrected the whole cursive, and removed this phrase, "in Ephesus." Therefore, the manuscript authority against the phrase is limited to the Vatican and Sinaitic uncials, that is, half-capital or majuscule manuscripts, the former denoted by B, and the latter by Aleph, א, the first letter in the Hebrew alphabet. In both manuscripts, the phrase "in Ephesus" has been added by later hands.

To note the value of those two manuscripts, it is necessary to remember the changes, undergone by the text of the Greek Testament. To the Autographs, made on perishable papyrus, succeeded the primitive copies, made without either the skill or the care of a modern compositor. Then came the second century, satisfying its passion for tradition with St. Irenaeus' *Heresies* among Christians, Rabbi Judah's *Mishnah* among Jews, Gaius' *Institutes* among Roman lawyers, and the Western Text of the Greek Testament. In the last case, therefore, the interpolations are not to be rejected as valueless, but to be held, especially in the *Acts of the Apostles*, as valuable testimony to traditions in the second century.

But when Origen went to Palestinian Caesarea in 231 A.D., and worked at textual and exegetical criticism, there grew up a more critical text, which is generally called the Neutral Text, as it is supposed to be uninfluenced to any extent by sources of error. Others, however, regard it as characterised by omissions; and of its great representative, the Vatican B, Dr. Dobbin, in the *Dublin University Magazine* for November, 1859, said it was "an abbreviated text of the New Testament." With this manuscript, we must class

the Sinaitic Aleph ; and it is quite possible that these were two of the fifty copies made under the direction of Eusebius, bishop of Palestinian Caesarea, at the command of the Emperor Constantine in 331. We may say that 231 to 331 was the golden age of the Neutral Text. Then came the Alexandrian Text, the older form being improved as a boy's exercise by a school-master. Finally, there appeared the Common or Received Text, which seems to have had its origin in a double revision at Antioch, and passed through Constantinople over the world, though not one of its characteristic readings can be found before the time of Chrysostom, who became chief preacher at Antioch in 386, and bishop of Constantinople in 398.

From this, it is plain that the Vatican B and Sinaitic Aleph generally represent one type of text. We must go further, and say that certain forms in their letters suggest one country, Egypt. Indeed, we may trace their birth to one library, for the same man, who copied out the Vatican B, copied out several pages of the Sinaitic Aleph. We need therefore be on our guard against these two manuscripts, when they practically oppose almost all the other ancient evidence in omitting the last twelve verses of *St. Mark* and the phrase "in Ephesus," *Eph.* i. 1. And having seen their probable connection with the school, founded by Origen in 231 at Caesarea, we are not surprised to find that Origen himself, as quoted in Cramer's *Caténæ* of 1842, has not got the phrase "in Ephesus" in his text.

Were nothing more to be said, we might well retain the phrase as unquestionable. But in 351 A.D., about twenty years after the two great manuscripts were made, St. Basil the Great passed from the schools of Cappadocian Caesarea to those of Athens. Afterwards, in his treatise, *against Eunomius*, ii. 19, he says that some before him, among whom he probably includes Origen, and some

ancient manuscripts, which he had seen, omitted the phrase. If then the two manuscripts may speak for Palestinian Caesarea and St. Basil for Cappadocian Caesarea in the middle of the fourth century, Tertullian may speak for Carthage, and Marcion for Sinope and Rome at a still earlier period. But this is testimony, which requires careful handling.

Marcion was born at Sinope on the Black Sea about the time when St. John wrote his Gospel, that is, at the end of the first century. His father became the bishop and he himself a presbyter in the church of his native town. Antisemite and Dualist, he was excommunicated at home ; and arriving at Rome in 142 A.D., he was refused admission among the faithful. His bible consisted of St. Luke's Gospel and ten Pauline epistles. But he altered the title of the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, so that it read "to the Laodiceans." Now Marcion had that prosaic mind and that passion for correcting everything written, which together enable their possessor to attain much eminence and little success in the less scientific departments of Higher Criticism. It may therefore have been merely the mention of an epistle to the Laodiceans in that *to the Colossians*, iv. 16, which suggested an alteration of the title in that *to the Ephesians*.

The title, of course, is not Pauline, for the Apostle would not have headed his letter "To Ephesians." But Marcion could not have altered the title, had the phrase "in Ephesus" been in the opening words, which form the superscription. At this point, we call Tertullian to give evidence. A trained lawyer and a Greek scholar, he speaks for the Latin church of Carthage, till he became a Montanist in 199. Writing *against Marcion*, v. 17, in the fifteenth year of Severus, 207-208, A.D., and charging him with altering the title of the Epistle, he does not appeal to the phrase

"in Ephesus," as he would have done, had it been in his copy ; but relies on "the truth of the Church."

But it is time to ask if the words can be omitted. Certainly the surviving words may be rendered "to the holy [ones], who are also faithful." But we note that in the *First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians*, 1 Cor. i. 2, 2 Cor. i. 1, the expression "to the church of God which is," is completed by the phrase "in Corinth." In the *Epistle to the Romans*, i. 7, the phrase, "to all who are," requires the words "in Rome." And in the *Epistle to the Philippians*, i. 1, the direction "to the saints in Christ Jesus who are " is defined by the phrase "in Philippi." So it is not probable that St. Paul, in *Eph.* i. 1, left the expression, "to the saints who are," suspended in the air, though the supposition gave Origen room for metaphysical gymnastics. And it is equally improbable that the Apostle addressed a letter "to the holy [ones] who are also faithful."

Beza, followed by Ussher in his *Annals of the Old and New Testaments*, 64 A.D., suggested that St. Paul left a blank space for the name of each city, in which the encyclical would be read. If that were so, other names would appear in place of "Ephesus" in some copies, and the greater number of copies would witness against that name. On the contrary, not only do the vast majority of witnesses support the word in the text, but no other name appears there, and the Ephesian destination is assumed by the Muratorian fragment of 170, by St. Irenaeus, *Heresies*, I. iii. 1, 4, viii. 4, V. ii. 36, between 182 and 188 A.D., by the Alexandrian Clement, *Stromateis* or "Miscellanies," iv. 65, before 202, and even by Origen in his commentary and in his treatise *against Celsus*, iii. 20, written in 249 A.D.

When we consider the verse, *Eph.* i. 1, itself, we see an

intrinsic and an analogous reason for retaining the phrase "in Ephesus," The words are

Eph. i. 1. To the holy [ones], who are in Ephesus,
And to [the] faithful [ones] in Christ Jesus.

There we see at once a parallel between "the holy" and "faithful," and a subtle suggestion in the parallel between "in Ephesus" and "in Christ Jesus." Further, both features are found in the *Epistle to the Colossians*, written immediately before that to the Ephesians.

Col. i. 2. To the holy [ones] in Colossae,
And to [the] faithful brothers in Christ.

To give full weight to all these considerations, and to resolve the Ephesian address, the un-Ephesian elements, the encyclical character and the undirected copies in a harmony, is not a difficult task. On his road from Rome to Colossae, Tychicus would pass through Ephesus and Laodicea. Having written his letter to Philemon at Colossae, another to the Christians at Laodicea, *Col.* iv. 16, and a third to the Christians at Colossae, St. Paul would write a fourth for the Christians at Ephesus. As he dictates it, his mind embraces the cities of Laodicea, Hierapolis and Colossae in the Valley of the Lycus. The traces of speed, vehemence and rapture are plain enough in the result. His mind is still full of Laodicean and Colossian affairs. Those churches are still before his imagination. And these things, together with his desire to write a statement of universal import, as he wrote the *Epistle to the Romans* four years before, produce an encyclical, primarily intended for Ephesus, but worldwide in its application. Copies will be carried to Laodicea and Colossae; and the phrase "in Ephesus" will sometimes be omitted as out of place in a letter, which has so little local import, but holds Laodicea and Colossae in its scope.

5. THE DELIVERY OF THE EPISTLE

Tychicus and Onesimus must journey by the stone causeway, named the Appian Way. This is the Queen of Roads, as Statius, now sixteen years of age, will by and by call it in his *Silvae*, II. ii. 12. Travelling about twenty miles a day, they must cover the 360 miles between Rome and Brundisium in the heel of Italy. On their way, they will pass Capua, Beneventum, Venusia and Tarentum. Coasting Epirus, they will reach Corinth. Disembarking there, they will visit the church and Gaius, the host of St. Paul and of the whole Church, *Rom.* xvi. 23. They must cross the Isthmus, and having embarked again, they will sail across the Ægean, perhaps stopping for a little at one or more of the Ægean islands. And in such a coasting voyage, it is interesting to note, the excellent harbour of Patmos was the last station between Rome and Ephesus. Then they will enter the Sacred Port of Ephesus.

As the vessel makes its way up the Cayster, these friends of St. Paul can see on their right the Racecourse or Stadium, where beasts fought with beasts, and even with men, in a struggle which supplied St. Paul with a figure of speech for his own conflict, when he wrote in 55 to Corinth from this place, 1 *Cor.* xv. 32. Beyond it lay the largest theatre in the world. This was cut in the sunset side of the hill, and admitted 50,000 persons within its unroofed space. Further eastward was the temple of the nature-goddess, Artemis. This marble splendour, one of the Seven Wonders of all the known world, was turned from the travellers, for it, like the Temple of Jerusalem, faced the east to receive the morning sun. Its precincts were a sanctuary and a home for criminals, Tacitus, *Annals*, iii. 63. Its courts housed eunuch priests and harlot priestesses. Its fane was a museum of paintings and sculptures, and a repository for royal treasures. But its central object, curtained

within the shrine or sanctuary, was a hideous image, carved with women's breasts and wild beasts' forms.

Though Pergamum will remain the official capital of Roman Asia till about 129, when Hadrian will transfer the dignity to Ephesus, the latter city is popularly held to be the metropolis. It is certainly pre-eminent in commerce, in the fame of its magic and its magical formulæ, known as "Ephesian Letters," in the popularity of its idol, and in the attraction of its festivals. It was governed by a proconsul, selected from the men who had held the consular office at Rome. But the city was more immediately under its senate and the mass-meetings in the theatre. The president of both senate and popular assembly was the so-called "town-clerk," the "*grammateus*" or "scribe of the Ephesians," an annual official, by whose name the year was known. Such a one was he who, four and a half years ago, calmed the silversmiths' riot, *Acts* xix. 35.

But more significant than the presiding town-clerk was the commune and association of the Asiarchs. For these had a larger sphere of action, their direction of the Imperial worship and games extending beyond the city to the whole province. Tychicus and Onesimus, as they enter Ephesus, carry one religion, that claims universal sway. The Asiarchs bore another. At the present moment, their cult of the deified Emperor was in its second phase. It had been the spontaneous tribute of oppressed peoples to the beneficent power, which delivered them from war and misrule. Now it has become suffused with the insanity of the epileptic, Gaius Caligula, and that of the vicious Nero. Yet another generation, and it will be a tool for Domitian's statecraft.

Altars and temples, state-officials and state-soldiery, wealth and popularity, are on the side of one religion, then sending forth its missionaries from Rome. Not far from Nero's palace in the capital city, and apparently

at the mercy of the Emperor's caprice another religion, sends forth its missionaries from Rome. To all outward seeming, this is chiefly represented by a worn and shrivelled little Jew, his shoulders bowed with age and the carrying of his loom, his Jewish features drawn with suffering, and his hands rough and grimy with stitching goats' hair canvas. For missionaries, there are those nine men around him ; and of these, he now sends forth the obscure Tychicus and the slave Onesimus with his Catholic encyclical.

The great Central Road from Ephesus to the Euphrates will lead the two messengers of St. Paul through the Mæander Valley eastward from Ephesus about a hundred English miles to Laodicea. Magnesia, Tralles and one of the cities named Antioch will be passed on the way. Then, further, eleven miles from Laodicea will take them to Colossæ, as six miles northward would have carried them to Hierapolis. The three cities lie in the Valley of the Lycus, a tributary of the Mæander ; and none of them has seen St. Paul face to face, *Col.* ii. 1. The district was sufficiently prosperous. Colossæ, in the upper valley, produced dark violet wool. Laodicea, in the lower valley, not only manufactured its own black wool, but also attained repute for finance and medicine. And Hierapolis, an ancient " sacred city," was fashionable for its medicinal hot springs, impregnated with alum, and of note for its Charonion or Plutonium, a deep man-hole from which the poisonous fumes of sulphuretted hydrogen issued, and suggested an entrance to hell.

Here, in this pleasant Lycus Valley, in a corner of Phrygia, is a battlefield between the Empire and the Church. At present, the former is building and preserving roads, and opening lines of communication by sea for its enemy in the war for a world. Its power seems beneficent in restraining so much of Jewish hostility and pagan ferocity. Its

sphere seems waiting for the new and true religion, that will dissolve its Caesarism in Christism. The very growth of its Imperial organism suggests metaphors for the growth of the Church. Its consolidation of races, unification of societies, organisation of service, and development of corporate life were held divine by subject peoples, who embodied their awe and gratitude in temples to Rome and its Emperor. Pope Leo the Great, 440-461 A.D., will declare that "Divine Providence prepared the Roman kingdom that the effect of grace beyond telling might be spread through the whole world." To St. Paul, it now whispers in stammering words of another organisation, divine indeed, builded as a temple, and instinct with a Life, which is eternal and Divine.

6. THE CHRONOLOGY

A Biblical problem is the more difficult to solve, because it is impossible to isolate it. So an interpreter of a book, or even of a text, is obliged to assume many things without indicating the arguments in proof of them. This is often the case with regard to ancient geography and ancient chronology, the warp of place and the weft of time, which form the web for the tapestry of ancient history.

Although it would be unreasonable to leave our present subject for a discussion of the various problems in New Testament chronology, it may be well to mention some of the dates we have adopted. We place the *Epistle of St. James* about 40 A.D., before the Gentile question troubled the Church of Jerusalem. We date St. Paul's *Epistle to the Galatians* immediately before his departure from Antioch for the Apostolic Council in Jerusalem, and therefore before the end of 49 A.D.

It would be very difficult to name all those, whose works have assisted us in reaching our conclusions, but we must

mention Zahn, Ramsay, Turner, F. R. M. Hitchcock, Anderson, Cornely, Lightfoot and Round.

We regard the fifteenth year of Tiberius, *Luke* iii. 1 as 26 A.D., Good Friday as April 7, 30, and the following Pentecost as May 28, 30.

In the year 33, we place St. Paul's Conversion.

In 35, after three years in Jewish reckoning, St. Paul returns from the desert to Damascus, from which he escapes to Jerusalem, *Gal.* i. 18, *Acts* ix. 26, and is sent to Tarsus.

In 36, Pilate and Caiaphas are deposed, Marcellus being put in Pilate's place for some months by Vitellius, the governor of Syria; Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII. iv. 2.

In 37, on March 16, the Emperor Tiberius dies, and is succeeded by Gaius Caligula, who at once appoints Marullus as procurator of Judæa, and gives his friend, Herod Agrippa I., the title of king and the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias; Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII. vi. 10. In the same year, Nero and Josephus are born.

In 38, there is a persecution of the Jews at Alexandria. Herod Agrippa I. leaves Rome for his province in Palestine. On his way, and early in August, he visits Alexandria. Flaccus is recalled; and in October, he returns to Rome from Egypt.

Setting out in the winter, and reaching Rome early in 39, the famous Jewish embassy, consisting of Philo, then an old man, and four others, sought an interview with the Emperor Gaius to plead for the Alexandrian Jews. And while they waited for the audience, promised to them, they heard that Gaius had ordered a colossal statue of himself to be erected in the Holy of Holies, and to be inscribed with his own name under the title of Jupiter; Philo, *On the Embassy to Gaius*, xxix. In the same year, the West saw the expedition of Gaius Caligula to Gaul and the Rhine.

In 41, on January 24, Gaius is assassinated. His uncle,

the feeble and weakminded, but good-natured Claudius, succeeds to the Imperial throne, and to the difficulty of finding corn and money for the people of Rome. Gaius had left the city-treasury and the city-granaries empty ; and this department of the administration is hampered by famines during the reign of Claudius. Herod Agrippa I. is made king over Judaea and Samaria, in addition to his other provinces, so that his realm is the same as that of his grandfather, Herod the Great.

In 42, a conspiracy against the Emperor was discovered ; and he became unduly subject to his wife Messalina and his freedmen Pallas and Narcissus, whom we must regard as responsible for much of his ill fame. Still Claudius continued to be diligent in the administration of justice and foreign affairs.

In 43, Claudius sends Aulus Plautius and four legions to invade Britain.

In the beginning of 44, Herod Agrippa I., who was devoting himself to the interests of Judaism, Josephus, *Antiquities*, XIX. vii. 3, began to persecute the church in Jerusalem. He slew St. James the Greater, and imprisoned St. Peter. The latter miraculously escaped ; and Herod himself died about Easter, in the beginning of Nisan, the Passover month, at Caesarea, *Acts* xii. 23, Josephus, *Antiquities*, XIX. viii. 2. Judaea was then added to the province of Syria, and placed under Cuspius Fadus as procurator.

Between Paul's persecution, closed by his conversion in 33, and Herod Agrippa's persecution, closed by his death in 44, the church in Palestine had peace, *Acts* ix. 31 ; and the period included St. Peter's vision and the baptism of Cornelius. It is to those years, untroubled by any serious difficulty as to the Gentiles, *Acts* xi. 18, that we attribute the *Epistle of St. James*, the Common Synoptic Tradition in Aramaic, and, if we may venture to touch the Synoptic

Problem, the composition of St. Matthew's Gospel in Aramaic. But beyond the borders of Palestine, some converted Jews, who had fled from Paul's persecution in 33, were preaching. And of them, some preached to Gentiles in Syrian Antioch with such success, that the attention of the church in Jerusalem was drawn to the matter. As the converted Hellenists, or Greek-speaking Jews of the Dispersion, who were engaged in this preaching, were natives of Cyprus and Cyrene, St. Barnabas, a convert Levite from Cyprus, is sent from Jerusalem, to inquire into the matter.

In Syrian Antioch, St. Barnabas remembers the convert Paul, whom he had introduced to the Apostles at Jerusalem in 35. He remembers too how they had sent the young man to his native city, Tarsus, *Acts* ix. 27, 30. So he sets out to find him. The road was excellent, and ran for about 120 miles between Syrian Antioch and Tarsus. It went northward for nearly half the distance, through the pass of the "Syrian Gates" in Mount Amánus to Issos on the Gulf of Alexandretta. Then it turned westward, crossing two rivers, the Pyramos and the Saros. Reaching Tarsus, St. Barnabas finds himself in "no mean city," *Acts* xxi. 39. It is a great centre of commercial activity; and Strabo, XIV. v. 13, in 19 A.D., regarded its university as superior in some respects to those of Athens and Alexandria. It would not be easy to find a particular man in such a city; and in the Jews' quarter, more than one would bear the name of Saul, as St. Paul still did. But the man, of whom St. Barnabas was in search, was not easily overlooked; and not many visits to the synagogues on Saturdays would be necessary to find him.

So St. Barnabas enlists St. Paul for the work at Syrian Antioch. There they labour together during the remainder of the year 44, and during part of 45. That "whole year,"

Acts xi. 26, at Syrian Antioch is marked by the revelation, of which St. Paul will speak in time to come, *2 Cor.* xii. 2, and by the prophecy, in which Agabus of Jerusalem will announce the coming famine, *Acts* xi. 28.

The harvest of the year 45 is bad. Jerusalem, however, is fortunate in the presence of Queen Helena, of Adiabene or Assyria, who had a palace in the city. And now, fourteen years after his conversion, *Gal.* ii. 1, St. Paul goes up to Jerusalem with St. Barnabas and Titus to help the Christians of Jerusalem in the famine. While there, he has a vision in the Temple, and receives a commission to the Gentiles, *Acts* xxii, 17. It would appear that his circumstances were not smooth at Jerusalem, and that the presence of the uncircumcised Greek, Titus, was a source of irritation, *Gal.* ii. 3. But the question of circumcising converts has not yet come to a head.

The question of eating with Gentiles becomes of immediate importance. It was probably in the year 46, when Tiberius Alexander was made procurator of Judaea, and while the famine continued in Palestine, that St. Peter visited Antioch. There he ate with the Gentiles, as his vision had taught him to do, *Acts* x. 15, and as he had done in the case of Cornelius, *Acts* xi. 3. But when some Christian Jews arrive at Antioch from St. James the Less at Jerusalem, St. Peter separates himself from the Gentiles, occasioning a memorable scene between the two Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, *Gal.* ii. 11-14, as it in turn will occasion a memorable dispute between two doctors of the Church, St. Jerome and St. Augustine.

Early in the following year, 47, and very probably in March, St. Barnabas and St. Paul commence their first missionary journey. They traversed Cyprus, evidently spending some time in the island.

It would probably be early in 48, that they sailed from

Paphos in Cyprus to Attalía in Pamphylia. At Perga, St. Mark leaves them, that he may return home to Jerusalem. Then probably, as Ramsay suggests in his *St. Paul*, 92-97, an attack of malarial fever urged the Apostle into Southern Galatia, where he preached on this, "the former time," through an infirmity of the flesh. His stay was short in Pisidian Antioch, but lasted a long time in Iconium, *Acts* xiv. 3. Then he and St. Barnabas proceed to Lystra, where a born cripple is healed, and, possibly on this occasion, Timothy's Jewish mother became a convert, *Acts* xvi. 1. At length, Jewish hostility prevails, and St. Paul is stoned. Rising from the ground, the Apostle re-enters the city, and proceeds next day to Derbe, where he makes many converts.

According to Josephus, rightly followed by Schürer, Cumanus becomes procurator of Palestine in this year, but Tacitus, *Annals*, xii. 54, who is followed by Mommsen, Blass, *Acts*, p. 21, and Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 313, describes him as governor of Galilee and contemporary of Felix, governor of Samaria.

In the next year, 49, St. Paul and St. Barnabas, having returned through the Galatian cities, and preached there "the latter time," sail back to Antioch. Now they find the new stage in the Jewish controversy. It is no longer a question of eating with Gentiles, but of circumcising converts. But this difficulty will not last a year, and will then pass away for ever. An Apostolic Council will meet at once to consider the matter. St. Paul and St. Barnabas must be present. But they hear that some would compel their converts in South Galatia to be circumcised, and keep the Jewish calendar, *Gal.* iv. 10, v. 2, vi. 12. That was inconsistent with the Gospel, which St. Paul had received by revelation, *Gal.* i. 12, and preached in Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe. Further, it would raise an insuperable barrier to the conversion of the Gentiles

and the Christianising of the Roman Empire. But St. Paul and St. Barnabas must start at once for Jerusalem. There is no time at this moment for another visit to Southern Galatia ; so St. Paul writes his *Epistle to the Galatians*. Visiting Jerusalem for the third time since his conversion, he attends the Apostolic Council. Then the compulsory circumcision of converts is laid to rest for ever.

Now as St. Paul returns to Antioch, he is accompanied by Barnabas and Mark, and by Silas and Judas. We may be allowed to interject our view that this Judas, named Bar-Sabbas, or son of Sabba, was brother of Joseph Bar-Sabbas, or son of Sabba, *Acts*, i. 23. There is no improbability that Sabba was another name of St. Joseph's brother, Cleophas or Alphaeus. If it was, all the references, connected with our Lord's "brethren," or cousins, remain consistent. Joseph Bar-Sabbas is named after his uncle, St. Joseph. And his brother, James the Less, is named after their grandfather, Jacob or James, *Matt.* i. 16. Judas, then, who is described in *Luke* vi. 16, as "of James," is the brother of James the Less, of Joseph or Joses Barsabbas, *Matt.* xxvii. 56, *Mark* xv. 40, and of Simon, who will succeed his brother, James the Less, as bishop of Jerusalem. Eusebius, *History*, iii. 11, iv. 22, in 61, the date of this *Epistle to the Ephesians*.

In the year 50, Seneca is prætor in Rome, having been recalled from exile last year. In this year, and probably early in the spring, St. Paul will undertake his second missionary journey in the companionship of Silas. During the summer, he stays in Southern Galatia, completing the work of his *Epistle to the Galatians* by the Apostolic decree and by the witness of Silas, who was an important person in the Church of Jerusalem, *Acts* xv, 22, 41. To avoid Jewish opposition, the Apostle circumcised Timothy at Lystra before taking him on the journey in the attendant's place,

which Mark had occupied. By October, he reaches Troas.

The Emperor Claudius had been favourable towards the Jews, and granted them privileges on account of his friendship with Herod Agrippa I., Josephus, *Antiquities*, XIX. iv. 5 v. 2, 3, vi. 3, XX. i. 1. But now towards the end of 50, Herod Agrippa has been dead nearly seven years; and alarmed by the prospect of a famine in Rome itself, or moved to anger by some dissensions, Claudius expels the Jews from Rome, *Acts* xviii. 2. Suetonius, who will be born in 75, will, writing of Claudius, xxv., in his *Lives of the Caesars*, attribute the expulsion to Jewish riots at the instigation of Chrestus, the remark being evidently suggested by some rumour of the relations between the converted and unconverted Jews. Dio Cassius, LX. vi. 6, writing after his own consulship in 229, will try to modify the statement of Suetonius, and say that the Jews were too numerous to be expelled, and were only forbidden to assemble. But Suetonius is supported by the contemporary evidence of the *Acts*. And in consequence of the decree, Aquila and Priscilla seek a home in Corinth, where they will meet St. Paul, who is now on his way to Thessalonica.

The next year, 51, is a time of excitement in the West. The Emperor adopts his stepson, Nero, as heir to the Imperial dignity, and after a visit of sixteen days to Britain, celebrates a triumph over the captive Caractacus. The early months of the year, probably till May, are spent by St. Paul in Thessalonica, from which he will reach Athens in August. From that city, he will send Timothy back to comfort the Thessalonians, 1 *Thess.* iii. 1, 2, and Silas probably to Philippi, *Phil.* iv. 15. After about a month in Athens, in the course of which he spoke before the Council of the Areopagus, but not on Mars' Hill, he proceeds in September to Corinth, where he will meet Aquila and

Priscilla, be joined by Timothy and Silas after a few weeks and commence a residence of eighteen months.

The next year, 52, is a time of excitement in the East, as the Parthians are invading Armenia. St. Paul writes his *First Epistle to the Thessalonians* about May, and his second about August. In the autumn, the Jews drag him before the proconsul of Achaia, who was then the Spaniard Gallio of Cordova, and brother of Nero's tutor, Seneca.

In this year, 52, there are troubles in the Tracheia or mountainous district of Cilicia, and Judaea is revolting against misgovernment, Tacitus, *Annals*, xii. 54, 55. After a time, king Antiochus, who reigned over Commagene from 37 to 74, broke the power of the barbarian forces in Cilicia. And now, the legate of Syria, Ummidius Quadratus, sends the procurator of Judaea, Ventidius Cumanus, with the high priest Jonathan, to Rome to be tried for his massacre of Zealots, who had massacred Samaritans for massacring some Galilaean pilgrims. The new procurator of Judaea was Antonius Felix who, like his elder brother, Pallas, the Emperor's millionaire favourite, appears to have been a freedman of the Emperor's mother, Antonia, but fantastically claimed descent from the kings of Arcadia, Tacitus, *Annals*, xii. 53.

Early in 53, St. Paul sails from Corinth to Ephesus, where he leaves Aquila and Priscilla; and he himself reaches Jerusalem in time for the Passover on March 22. It is his fourth visit to the city since his conversion. In the summer, he returns to Antioch, Apollos at the same time passing from Alexandria to Ephesus and Corinth. Then St. Paul undertakes his third missionary journey. Apparently, he sets out in July, spends about two months among the Galatian Christians of Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, and reaches Ephesus in October. After preaching for three months in the synagogue, he took up

his theme every day during the leisure hours from 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. in the lecture-room of Tyrannus.

After St. Paul had been so occupied for about nine months, on October 13; 54, Claudius died. His apotheosis followed in the senatorial decree of divine honours to him, Tacitus, *Annals*, xii. 69. Seneca, indeed, described the deification as *apokolokyntosis*, that is, "pumpkinification." Nero succeeded, and began his five years of happy government. Even the Western fear of a Parthian invasion subsided somewhat, when the Parthian king promised peace.

Nearly a year later, St. Paul, still occupied in Tyrannus' lecture-room, was troubled by news of the Corinthian church; and in the autumn of the year, 55, he sent Titus, probably by sea, from Ephesus to Corinth with his *First Epistle to the Corinthians*. It was a time of incessant labour, anxiety and conflict for the Apostle. To this period, and to the companions of St. Paul, we may reasonably refer the origin of the churches, which rose in the Lycus Valley and the rest of Roman Asia. And now in this autumn, he proposes to remain till next Pentecost, 1 *Cor.* xvi. 8.

But in the January of the next year, 56, after two years and three months, reckoned in Jewish fashion as three years, *Acts* xx. 31, spent in Ephesus, St. Paul is driven from that city by the silversmiths' riot, and sets out towards Macedonia, hoping to meet Titus with news of the Corinthian Church. A door for missionary work is opened at Troas, but Titus is not there, 2 *Cor.* ii. 13; and therefore St. Paul must hurry on to Macedonia as soon as he can get a passage in a vessel. There, at Philippi, he meets Titus, receives his good report, and sends him back with two companions, 2 *Cor.* viii. 16-24. After they have gone, St. Paul, assisted by Timothy, writes the *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, and forwards it. Towards the end of the

year, he goes to Corinth ; and Aquila and Priscilla leave Ephesus for Rome, where they are found in January, next year, *Rom.* xvi. 3.

In that January of 57, St. Paul writes his *Epistle to the Romans* from Corinth. He is proposing to go to Jerusalem with alms, *Rom.* xv. 25. Having spent December, January and February in Corinth, he sets out ; but he must not go in a pilgrim ship, as some Jews desire to kill him. Travelling by land, he reaches Philippi at Passover, Thursday, April 7. On Tuesday, April 19, he arrives at Troas, where he and the European trustees of the fund meet Tychicus and Trophimus, the Asiatic trustees, *Acts* xx. 4, we reading verse 5 with *pros-*, "toward," not with *pro-*, "before." On Saturday, April 30, the Apostle addresses the elders at Miletus. On Saturday, May 14, he reaches Caesarea ; and on Pentecost, Saturday, May 28, he is in Jerusalem. The riot and his arrest follow. Within a few days, he has an opportunity of defending himself before Felix the procurator, a man cruel, licentious and influenced by bribes. After some time, St. Paul was allowed to speak before Felix and his wife Drusilla, one of the three queens, whom this freedman Felix married. This lady was the youngest daughter of Herod Agrippa I., and had deserted her husband, Azizus, king of Emésa, the modern Homs on the Orontes.

All through the year 58, St. Paul remains in custody at Caesarea. He has many opportunities of conversing with Felix ; and St. Luke has many opportunities of collecting material for his *Gospel* and *the Acts* from the church in Jerusalem and from St. Philip the deacon at Caesarea, *Acts* xxi. 8.

In the summer of 59, after two whole years, *Acts* xxiv. 27, St. Paul appears before Porcius Festus, the successor of Felix, and then he appeals to Nero. But that Emperor's

five happy years are now being cut short in the murder of his own mother. Before he sets out as a prisoner to Rome, St. Paul will have an opportunity of addressing Drusilla's brother, Herod Agrippa II., under whom the Temple was finished, and her sister Berenice, who was born about 28 A.D., and married at thirteen years of age to her uncle, Herod of Chalcis, and then in 48 A.D. to Pólemon II., made king of Pontus in 39 A.D. by the Emperor Caligula; Josephus, *Antiquities*, XIX. viii. 1, XX. vii. 3, Ramsay, *Cities of St. Paul*, pp. 358, 359. By and by, in 68, and again in 75, she will live in intimacy with Titus, the public opinion of Rome proving a bar to the marriage; Suetonius, *Titus* vii. In August, however, St. Paul must sail for Rome; and early in November, he will be shipwrecked.

In the February of the next year, 60, St. Paul will sail from Malta, and reach Rome in March.

In the spring of the following year, 61, he writes four epistles, one to Philemon, another to the Laodiceans, unhappily lost, a third to the Colossians, and the fourth, the encyclical. After some months, the Apostle will write a fifth "epistle of the first captivity" to the Philippians. We may add that Festus dies in this year. Nero sends Albinus to take his place, but before the new procurator will reach his province, St. James the Less will have been slain by the Jews; Eusebius, *History* II. i. 25, Josephus, *Antiquities*, XX. ix. 1.

7. THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Textual Criticism is pursued with such enthusiasm, that it must occupy a large space in a modern commentary. For the convenience of those, who have not spent time and labour on this important branch of Biblical study, we will treat the disputed readings more fully than some may approve. Yet these latter scholars will pardon us

for what is really an effort to attract others to this entrancing subject. And we would show those, who have not so far attended to the matter, that a difference of one letter may present a problem at least as interesting as one in chess or pure mathematics.

In discussing such questions, we had hoped that it would have been possible to discard what Bentham would have described as "question-begging epithets," and to substitute more scientific terms than "Western," "Neutral," "Alexandrian" and "Syrian." But those adjectives so prevail in all current literature on the subject, that it would be impossible to adopt Gregory's nomenclature or even Kenyon's lettering. We must therefore retain them, explaining more fully than we have already done what we mean by them.

The Western Text of the Greek Testament, Kenyon's delta-text, or Gregory's Re-Wrought Text, represents that current from the year 100 to 200 A.D. It is emphatically a Traditional Text, marked by glosses and interpolations. As such, it was characteristic of a traditional century, which saw Rabbi Judah the Holy collect Jewish traditions in the *Mishnah*, or "Oral Law," and St. Irenaeus, at the same time, between 182 and 188, gather Christian traditions in his book *against Heresies*, while Gaius, a little earlier, sometime between 117 and 180 A.D., completes his *Institutes*, which not only present the Roman Law of that day, but also traditions connected with the legal institutions and formularies. That Western Text is generally represented by the Old Latin and the Old Syriac versions, and to some extent by the Sahidic version of Southern Egypt. It is the text in St. Justin Martyr, who had his controversy with the Jew Trypho at Ephesus in 132, and wrote his *First Apology* at Rome in 150. It is the text of his pupil Tatian, who wrote an *Oration against the Greeks*

about 160 A.D., and composed a *Diatessaron*, or *Harmony of the Gospels*. It is also the text used by Marcion, who arrived in Rome in 142, and of St. Irenaeus, who visited Rome with a letter from the Lyonese Church in 177. All the earliest writers in all quarters present it. And it is well illustrated by the two sixth century manuscripts, the Codex Bezae of the Gospels and Acts, and the Claromontanus of the Pauline epistles, both being noted as D, though the former was probably made in Lyons, and the latter in Egypt.

The Neutral Text, Gregory's Original Text, or Kenyon's beta-text, is really an early Alexandrian or Caesarean form. It is, roughly speaking, the text of the third century in Palestinian Caesarea and Alexandria. It may be dated from 250 to 350 A.D., or better still, from Origen's removal from Alexandria to Caesarea in 231 to the production of fifty manuscripts at Caesarea in 331 by Eusebius the bishop at Constantine's command. Among those fifty manuscripts may have been the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, which were made in the same library, whether they were produced under the eye of Eusebius, or obtained by him from Alexandria. Those two manuscripts are generally representative of the Neutral Text, so-called because it is supposed by its advocates to be free from Western interpolations, from the corrections of Alexandrian scholars, and from the conflations or combined readings of Syrian writers. The same form of the text is also represented to a great extent by the Bohairic version of Northern Egypt, by the manuscripts which St. Jerome used for the Latin Vulgate of 384, and sometimes by St. Clement, who was head of the catechetical school at Alexandria from 189 to 202.

The Alexandrian Text, Gregory's Polished Text, or Kenyon's gamma-text, is marked by scholarly corrections and the smoothing over difficulties as to proper names. It is

illustrated by some readings, found in the Sinaitic Aleph of the fourth century and the Angelic L of the ninth, as well as in the Alexandrian Clement, Origen and the Bohairic version. In the *Acts* and the *Epistles*, it is well represented by the Alexandrian A and the Ephraem palimpsest C, the former the earlier, but both of the fifth century.

We may speak of the Syrian Text, without taking a side in the controversy as to two Syrian revisions. One such revision, although there is no record of it, is associated with Antioch and Lucian, who was martyred in 312, in the persecution by Maximinus. Now it is true that the churches from Antioch to Constantinople used Lucian's revised edition of the Septuagint or Greek Vulgate in reading the Old Testament, just as Alexandria and Egypt used that by Hesychius, and Palestine, Origen's edition as published by Eusebius and Pamphilus. So St. Jerome tells us in his preface to *Chronicles*. It is also true that Lucian's text of the Old Testament Greek, like that of the New Testament Greek in St. Chrysostom and others in the neighbourhood of Antioch, was marked by conflate readings, combining two rival variants. Further, no characteristic Syrian readings are found before 250, not even in such representative writers as the Carthaginian Tertullian, who became a Montanist in 199, or St. Cyprian, who was consecrated for Carthage about 248, or Clement, who presided over the Alexandrian school from 189 to 202, or his successor, Origen, who presided from 203 to 231, or Irenaeus, consecrated for Lyons in 177, or Hippolytus, whom Origen heard preach at Rome in 211. The character of the Syrian Text is definite, whether we deny an Antiochian revision or allege one such revision in the middle of the fourth century, or acknowledge two such revisions, the earlier in the middle or end of the third century, and the later in the middle of the fourth. The result of whatever

process did take place was the Syrian or Antiochian Text, Gregory's Official Text, Kenyon's alpha-text, Bengel's Byzantine Text, or Burgon and Miller's Traditional Text. This was fully formed about 350, that is, soon after the founding of Constantinople at Byzantium on November 26, 329.

In general, it is not very difficult to discover the dominant character of any witness to the text. These witnesses are, of course, the uncial manuscripts, written in half-capitals, the cursives or minuscules, the versions, and ecclesiastical writers. To determine the character of a witness, we may take several cases of triple variants, one representing the Alexandrian type, another a Western interpolation, and the third a Syrian conflation, and note with which class the manuscript generally agrees. Thus, for example, in *Ephesians* v. 19, the Alexandrian type is represented by "with the heart," without a preposition in Greek, and the Western by "in the hearts," the preposition "in" being interpolated, and the noun put in the plural. The Syrian form conflates the two, taking the "in" from the Western and the singular from the Alexandrian. We must not, however, suppose that the distinction between the types is always such a simple matter. This will be evident presently, when we deal with some variants.

Hutton, in his excellent *Atlas of Textual Criticism*, has given us several tables, which are of the greatest value in this regard. In that which deals with the Pauline epistles, he takes five passages from the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, and shows the relation of many witnesses to the variant readings.

(1) In *Eph.* ii. 8, the Alexandrian reading is

For you have been delivered by the grace
By means of faith.

The Western interpolates "His" before "grace," and

changes "you" to "we." The Syrian inserts "the" before "faith."

(2) In *Eph.* iii. 21, the Alexandrian text reads

To Him [be] the glory in the Church
And in Christ Jesus.

The Western changes the order of "Church" and "Christ Jesus"; but the Syrian retains the order, and omits "and."

(3) In *Eph.* v. 19, we have seen that the Alexandrian reading is "with the heart"; the Western, "in the hearts"; and the Syrian, "in the heart."

(4) In *Eph.* v. 21, the Alexandrian text reads "of Christ"; the Western, "of Christ Jesus" or "of Jesus Christ"; and the Syrian, "of God."

(5) In *Eph.* vi. 18c, the Alexandrian has "unto it"; the Western interpolates "always"; and the Syrian adds "this thing."

Now, when we examine the witnesses, we find that in every case, the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, both of Cent. iv., support the Alexandrian Text. The Western reading is upheld in every case by the Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., with the Old Latin version as represented by the Claromontanus d, of Cent. vi., and its copy, the Sangerman e, of Cent. ix. The Syrian form is presented in every case by Theodoret, who became a Syrian bishop about 423, and by certain cursives, 29, 30 and 221, of Cent. xii., 249 and 270, of Cent. xiii., 250, 271 and 274, of Cent. xiv.

Speaking of our chief witnesses, we may say that in general there is an Alexandrian Text in the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, of Cent. iv., and in the Alexandrian A and the Ephraem C, of Cent. v. There is a Western Text in the Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., and in its copy, the Sangerman E, the Augien F and its fellow-copy, the Boernerian G,

all of Cent. ix. There is a Syrian Text in the Moscovian K and the Angelic L, both of Cent. ix., and in many cursives, these beginning in that ninth century, though cursive or minuscule letters were used for papyri in Cent. iii. B.C.

8. PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

In writing this commentary. I have tried to save the reader trouble. That is my excuse for repeating dates and other notes.

Claiming as a right, what is accorded without question to Catholics in France, Italy and elsewhere, I have employed those forms of scriptural names, which are current among people of my own tongue. And in references to the Old Testament, I have adopted the Hebrew numbering.

In reference to such commentaries as those of St. Jerome, Cornelius a Lapide, Westcott and others, I have generally thought the author's name sufficient, as the place is implicitly indicated by the text under discussion.

As my only object is to convey St. Paul's meaning and manner, as far as I can, to my readers, I have set his words in the lines, which were natural to a Jewish writer ; and the parallelism, so often obvious, will justify me.

There is another matter, which I approach with less confidence of approval, as I undertook it with less readiness of will. In rendering St. Paul's sentences, I held it fairer to English readers to present the Greek in an English form as similar as possible. Consequently, it often appears broken, sometimes uncouth, and occasionally obscure. It would, of course, have been possible to polish the translation, as Alexandrian grammarians polished the Greek Text. But the result would have had as little connection with St. Paul, as Pope's *Iliad* with Homer.

This in view, the reader will perhaps bear with the methods I have adopted to distinguish the aorist or indefi-

nite past tense from the present in the imperative, and from the perfect in the participle.

I trust that none will suspect any expression of implying disrespect in regard to those from whom I may be constrained to differ. Our common love and reverence for the Sacred Scriptures, and my own sincere appreciation of their labours and scholarship, are sufficient to protect them against any such misuse of my pen. I have sat at the feet of many, Catholics and Jews, Evangelicals and Ritualists, Unitarians and Plymouth Brethren. From each, in one way or another, I have learned something of the Bible. And never yet have I found my loyalty to the Catholic Church, or my gratitude for her supernatural light, inconsistent with an acknowledgment of what such Biblical scholars have taught me of manuscripts, languages, history and scientific exegesis.

In conclusion, I would record my debt to those, whose help and encouragement enabled me to produce this work in explanation of St. Paul's most sublime epistle. Among them, I must name Mrs. Margaret Scriven, Mrs. Amy Sinclair, Mrs. T. J. Curtis, Miss Lilla Pickwoad, Captain Ian R. Grant, R.N., Edward J. Fooks, Esq., and Dr. Campbell Smith.

St. Anne's College of the Ladies of Mary,
Sanderstead.

The Feast of St. Jerome, *Sept.* 30, 1912.

CHAPTER I

GOD'S DESIGN

Eph. i. 1, 2. The Superscription

As the inspired Apostle commences to dictate his encyclical, the Semite sense of God's providence speaks in the announcement of himself as

**Eph. i. 1. Paul, apostle of Christ Jesus,
By means of [the] will of God.**

No other name is here associated with his own, though he had just added St. Timothy's in the salutation to the Colossians. There is not one unnecessary word ; and yet there is sufficient to suggest the long line of Old Testament prediction, his own immediate commission from the Christ, and that divine purpose, which every fact in the New Testament order illustrated and furthered. The emphasis in his phrases on the will of God connects his present mention of it with the Eternal Design. We need not, therefore, assume a contrast with man's will or such a defence of his apostolate, as that demanded in the case of the Galatians.

As to his readers, he describes them in addressing the epistle

**Eph. i. 1. To the holy [ones], who are in Ephesus,
And to [the] faithful [ones] in Christ Jesus.**

We noted the objections to the phrase, "in Ephesus"; but we concluded that it is Pauline, although the Pauline outlook at this moment extends to the cities of the Lycus Valley, Colossae, Laodicea and Hierapolis. The parallelism confirms our conclusion, while it suggests a contrast between the position of the readers in the natural order, "in Ephesus," and that which they occupy in the supernatural order, "in Christ." There is also a balance in the words, which describe their state. As they are holy in consecration to God and separation from evil, so they are also faithful to that calling. The word, rendered "faithful," may indeed imply trusting or trusty, believing or faithful; but the second meaning is the better in the present case, for the Apostle, in the *Epistle to the Colossians*, which he has just finished, had added the word "brothers." Now, "believing brothers" would be nothing more than "brothers," so the expression should mean "faithful brothers." Therefore, we render the Greek word by "faithful" in the present parallel passage.

Having named the author and the readers, St. Paul adds the salutation,

**Eph. i. 2. Grace to you
And peace**

**From God, our Father,
And Lord, Jesus Christ.**

The Greek form, *chairein*, "rejoice," had been used in the *Epistle of St. James* i. 1, about 40 A.D., in the Apostolic decree, *Acts* xv. 23, and in the letter of Claudius Lysias to Felix, *Acts* xxiii. 26. The Oriental form, "peace," is found in the Aramaic version of a letter by Artaxerxes I. Longimanus, in 465 B.C., his salutation, "Peace and according to [the] time," being equivalent to "Peace *et cetera*,"

Ezra iv. 17. And it also occurs in the Aramaic of *Ezra* v. 7, *Dan.* iv. 1, vi. 25. Now, St. Paul combines both the Greek salutation and the Hebrew. But, at the same time, he lifts both to the plane of the supernatural order, the Greek *chairein*, "rejoice," becoming *cháris*, "grace," or God's "favour," and the Hebrew *shālôm*, "peace," being used of admission to friendship with God. Dark days will come. And then, for St. Timothy, set as a man of God amid perils of body and soul, St. Paul will pray not only God's favour and peace, but also His mercy, 1 *Tim.* i. 2, 2 *Tim.* i. 2.

As in both his *Epistles to the Corinthians*, and in that to the *Romans*, the blessings are sought

From God, our Father,
And Lord, Jesus Christ.

The names of "God" and "Father" are specially given to the First Person of the Eternal Trinity as the Primal and Everlasting Fount of Being. But the Second Person is none the less co-ordinated with Him in the parallel line. The title "Lord" confesses the dominion of Jesus; and it is equivalent to Jehovah as it lacks an article in the Greek. The title, "Christ" or "Messiah," that is "Anointed," describes our Lord as Jehovah Manifested, "the Coming One," who had come. The word "Messiah," or *Māshíach*, suggests all that was involved in Jewish expectation. Much of this is overlooked in the popular use of the Greek equivalent *christós*, or "Christ." But as it is impossible to make the word "Messiah" widely current, we can only insist upon the full meaning of the word "Christ."

Eph. i. 3. The Ascription

In the ascription, St. Paul does not begin with his thought of his readers, as in 1 *Thess.* i. 2, 2 *Thess.* i. 3, and *Col.* i. 3,

in which he commences by thanking God for them. But he opens with a psalm of praise to God, as he did five years before, in 56 A.D., when Titus had brought him good news from Corinth. Then he wrote,

2 Cor. i. 3. Blessed [is] the God and Father
Of our Lord, Jesus Christ,

The Father of mercies
And God of every consolation.

The devout Jew, by a habit that is more than second nature, is led on almost every occasion to thank God in some formula, which commences with the words, "Blessed art Thou, Lord our God, King of the World." About a hundred such forms may be found in Rabbinical books. And since grace builds on nature, St. Paul, naturally influenced by Jewish piety, and supernaturally influenced by the Holy Spirit, turns to God, and dictates,

Eph. i. 3. Blessed [is] the God and Father
Of our Lord, Jesus Christ.

So, as in the preceding couplet, a parallel is formed by the Father and the Son. As to the word "blessed," it will be remembered that the Highpriest used it for the Divine Name, when he asked our Lord,

Mark xiv. 61. Thou art the Christ,
The Son of the Blessed ?

Always in the Greek text of the New Testament, and almost always in the Greek Vulgate of the Old, the word is used of God, and of Him alone. Here indeed, St. Paul is speaking of the First Person in the Ever-Blessed Trinity, whom the Divine Son and Eternal Word, having become incarnate,

could regard not only as Father but also as God, so that He could say to His disciples,

John xx. 17. I am ascending toward My Father
And your Father,

And My God
And your God.

And in this encyclical we will presently meet the words,

Eph. i. 17. In order that the God of our Lord, Jesus Christ,
The Father of glory

When we speak of blessing God, it is plain that we do not imply any addition to His intrinsic and essential glory. It is our utmost reach to praise Him and glorify Him merely extrinsically; and that blessing from us is only a pale reflection of the intrinsic and essential blessing, which He has given us. Therefore, St. Paul confesses what has been done for us by God,

Eph. i. 3. Who blessed us
In every spiritual blessing.

It is not a blessing in the city and the field, in the basket and the store, *Deut.* xxviii, 3-5. And to make clear what he means by these spiritual blessings, St. Paul tells his readers of the sphere, in which it is found, that is

Eph. i. 3c. In the heavenlies,
In Christ.

The meaning of the phrase, "in the heavenlies," will have some connection with the parallel phrase "in Christ." It is interpreted by the Syriac Vulgate as "in the heavens." In *Eph.* i. 20, it will be so represented by Victorinus, about

360, the Vatican manuscript B, about 331, St. Hilary of Poitiers, about 354, the cursive 7, of Cent. xi. and the cursive 213, of Cent. xiv. The expression, peculiar to this encyclical, and characteristic of it, is found again in ii. 6, iii. 10, and vi. 12. It will be better to postpone the proper discussion of the phrase till its last occurrence, vi. 12, in the section on the "Resistance of the Christian Warrior," vi. 10-17, that the earlier instances may guide us to its meaning.

It is, however, sufficiently clear that the blessings belong to the supernatural order, and are dynamically related to the natural and visible world. They are found in real but mystical union and communion with Incarnate God. Although "in every spiritual blessing" may seem a strange expression, it is better to preserve the preposition, as it indicates the order of things, in which we find our good; and the three lines which commence with "in" have a cumulative effect.

As to the phrase, "in Christ," St. Paul alone can unfold its meaning, for it is characteristically Pauline. Twenty-nine times it is found in his epistles. Elsewhere, it is only met three times, and then in the *First Epistle of St. Peter*, which was greatly influenced by this encyclical. The phrase takes form as "in the Christ," in four other Pauline passages, three of them in the present epistle. The presence of the article presents the word as a title, the absence of the article implying that it is used as a proper name. In forty-three other passages, the phrase is enlarged as "in Christ Jesus." The expression cannot be explained as "by means of Christ." As we shall find, the blessing is given by God in Christ, *Eph.* iv. 32. It is given to us in that close union with Him, which constitutes redeemed men His members, *Eph.* v. 30, and His Mystical Body, completing Him, *Eph.* i. 23.

Eph. i. 4. Election.

Having indicated the spiritual blessings by reference to their sphere, St. Paul proceeds to enumerate them. First of all, God, who is to be blessed, so blessed us in Christ,

**Eph. i. 4. According as He selected us for Himself in Him
Before the foundation of [the] world,**

**For us to be holy and unblemished before Him
In love.**

The first blessing, then, is selection in the eternal purpose for a condition of consecration to God, and of freedom from sin. The fact of selection alone is asserted. It is not the moment to vindicate its justice by pointing to God's foreknowledge of those who would co-operate with His grace, and to His consequent selection of them. It is God's act alone, that is in question. Though the Greek verb, which we render as "He selected for Himself," may be used as meaning merely "He selected," yet the reflexive element can hardly be neglected in the present case. It was a selection for Himself, always the highest object of action, and then, the only possible one. The phrase "in Him" also is essential, for it is "in Christ," as members of His Body, we were chosen before any created thing came into existence with space and time. It is probably from this sentence that St. Peter, two years later, in the spring of 62, borrowed the phrase, "before [the] foundation of [the] world," when he spoke of Christ as a lamb,

**1 Pet. i. 20. Foreknown indeed before [the] foundation of
[the] world,**

**But manifested at [the] end of the times on
account of you.**

There is a third place, in which the phrase is found. But there it would be more than rash to assert that St. John, though he shows a knowledge of this epistle, made use, about the year 100, of St. Paul's expression to render the Aramaic of our Lord's words,

John xvii. 24. Because Thou didst love Me
Before [the] foundation of [the] world.

But God selected us in Him, that is, in Christ, that we should be holy and unblemished before Him, that is, before Himself. That such a real holiness and such a real freedom from blemish would be required of us by God is witnessed by our own conscience, by the common consent of mankind, and by the inspired Apostle, when he wrote to the Thesalonians, saying,

1 Thess. iv. 3. For this is the will of God—
Your sanctification.

And again he writes in the same letter,

1 Thess. iv. 7. For God did not call us on condition of
uncleanness,
But in sanctification.

Now we must consider whether we are right in joining the phrase "in love" to the requirement of a holy and unblemished state. Does God demand that holiness and blamelessness subsist in Christian love as at once the field of Christian virtues, their bond and their crown? In that case, the phrase "in love" refers to our love. And it is properly joined to the words which precede it, as in *Eph.* iv. 2, 15, 16, v. 2; *Col.* ii. 2, and 1 *Thess.* v. 13. This mode of connecting the words is confirmed by the other verses of the present passage, in which such qualifying clauses must be linked to the preceding, and not to the

succeeding words, *Eph.* i. 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10. Were it otherwise, as is supposed by St. Chrysostom before 398, the Syriac Vulgate in 411, and Mopsuestian Theodore before 429, then we should be obliged to explain "in love" as "in God's love," and to render the next line a :

Eph. i. 5. When He pre-determined us in love unto adoption.

Or with still less probability, we should be led, with the Syrian Ephraem, about 373, and Pelagius, who began to spread heresy in Rome in 405, to connect the phrase "in love" with the verb "chosen" at the beginning of the verse, and to say that God selected us in love. But the phrase is found again in *Eph.* iii. 17, iv. 2, 15, 16, v. 2; and in every case denotes love, that proceeds from us, and not from God.

***Eph.* i. 5, 6a. Predestination.**

Predestination follows the act of choice and selection. At least, so St. Paul represents the process, as he uses human language to express Divine operations, which cannot involve any change intrinsically in God. In reasoning upon such matters, the mind of man is easily lost in wandering mazes, because our intellects must travel from point to point, and contemplate some particle of the infinite truth, as a microscope isolates and emphasises some tiny detail.

We know indeed that there is an eternal act of predestination, the kingdom of the blessed being prepared for them from [the] foundation of [the] world, *Matt.* xxv. 34. We know that God's acts are eternal, and do not involve any intrinsic change in Him. We know also that our call is not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, 2 *Tim.* i. 9. Indeed, no natural works of

ours could merit any supernatural grace, much less the complete grace of predestination, in its full sense as embracing the whole series of graces from the first grace to the final glory. We know too that predestination and reprobation are both conditional. That is implied in God's justice, and His desire for the salvation of all men, *1 Tim. ii. 4*. And even St. Paul feared lest he should become disapproved, although he had preached to others, *1 Cor. ix. 27*.

To shew the internal harmony of the doctrine and its external harmony with philosophy, the Thomists will make a distinction in the grace, the predestined receiving efficacious as well as sufficient grace. The Congruists will find a distinction in the circumstances of the persons, God giving grace to the predestined in circumstances, in which they will accept it. And the Molinists will seek their distinction in the human will, the predestined being those who will freely accept God's grace.

The mind of St. Paul, balanced by its contemplative and missionary activities, vigorous in its sway of men, and lowly in its surrender to God, does not pause even a moment on the problem, which so many regard as insoluble, but hastens forward to tell how God further blessed us,

**Eph. i. 5. When He pre-determined us unto adoption
By means of Jesus Christ unto Him.**

It is true that the word, which we have rendered "when He pre-determined," is a participle. But it is in the aorist or indefinite past time. And we have no English participle to represent a momentary act in the indefinite past. The perfect participle, "having pre-determined," would connect the result of the act with the present time.

We note now that the pre-determination or pre-destination was not independent of our Lord. It involved the Incarnation of the Eternal Son, and the anointing of Him

as Head of all the creation. As Jesus and as Christ, He, the Son of God by nature, will lift some of His creatures to share the Divine Life as sons of God by adoption. Therefore the parallel lines balance the expression "when He pre-determined us" by the phrase "by means of Jesus Christ," and the words "unto adoption" by the words "unto Him," that is, unto God the Father Himself.

The employment of adoption to illustrate the Christian's position is peculiarly Pauline, the five Biblical occurrences of the word being confined to his epistles, *Gal.* iv. 5, *Rom.* viii. 15, 23, ix. 4, and the present passage, *Eph.* i. 5. In the pre-Christian Greek inscriptions of the Ægean Islands, however, there are numerous examples, a man being described as such a one "but according to adoption the son of such a one." The antithesis, as Deissmann points out in his *Bible Studies*, p. 239, is between *katà genesin*, "according to origin" and *kath' huiiothesian de*, "but according to adoption."

Although there was informal adoption among the Jews, as in Mordecai's adoption of Esther, *Esther* ii. 7, and Jeconiah's adoption of Salathiel, the son of Neri, *Jer.* xxii. 30, *Matt.* i. 12, it did not imply all that St. Paul means by the word. In Israel, a childless man might find an heir through the marriage of his widow with his brother, as Heli found a son in St. Joseph, actually the child of Jacob, *Luke* iii. 23, *Matt.* i. 16, Eusebius, *History*, I. vii. 6, Heli and Jacob being brothers by the same mother. But according to Greek custom, current in the Galatian cities of Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, a man adopted a son by making him his heir, as we, in Pauline language, became sons of Abraham by becoming heirs of his faith, *Gal.* iii. 7, because it followed, if heirs, then children. But a Roman would have said, if children, then heirs, as St. Paul does in addressing the Roman Christians, viii. 17.

Now adoption in the Roman form implied the sale of the person by his natural father and the purchase of him by his adoptive one. Witnesses were required; and according to the ancient rite, a pair of scales was struck with a piece of copper, this being a survival of a more primitive barter. But when the person had been adopted, he entered on all the rights and duties of a son. Therefore, St. Paul speaks of Christians as using the language of sons, crying "Father," *Rom.* viii. 15, because they have already received the Spirit of adoption. And yet the adoption is imperfect, because the full rights of sonship are withheld till the redemption of the body, *Rom.* viii. 23.

Our predestination to adoption was

Eph. i. 5. According to the good pleasure of His will,
6a. To [the] praise of [the] glory of His grace.

Again, we note a reference to God's will, such as that in *Eph.* i. 1, which explained St. Paul's apostolate. Here indeed, we contemplate the eternal order, and learn the eternal decree of the Triune God, whose will and purpose are one with His own Essential Being and Nature. Good infinitely and eternally as He is, what seems to His Will to be well is truly good. And His adoption of us is what seemed to be well, His good pleasure, His good will, or purpose. So we multiply expressions to render the Greek word *eudokia*, coined indeed by the Greek Vulgate to translate the Hebrew word *rātsón*, "delight" or "goodwill," of the Psalms. It is also used in St. Luke's version of the Angelic Song to indicate the men in whom God is well pleased, for the true text in these parallels runs,

Luke ii. 14. Glory in [the] highest [heavens] to God,
 And peace on earth among men of [His] good
 pleasure.

And as our predestination to adoption was according to the benevolence of His will, it was also to [the] praise of [the] glory of His grace, for His grace and unbought favour became manifested by such an action. That manifestation of His grace became His extrinsic glory, which in turn becomes His praise even now, both in the voices of intelligent beings and in the inarticulate utterances of the whole irrational creation, straining forward as it expects the revealing of the sons of God, *Rom.* viii. 19.

To the Greek, the word *cháris*, "grace," first of all suggested graceful speech or form, then favourable regard or deed towards such an object, and finally, gratitude for such favour. The Greek Vulgate used the word chiefly for the Hebrew *chēn*, "favour," in the sense of favourable regard. In the Greek Testament, the word is used for a favourable regard, *Acts* ii. 47, vii. 46, xxiv. 27, xxv. 9, and for a favourable deed, *Acts* xxv. 3. It is freely used of God's favourable act in admitting Gentiles to the New Covenant, for example, *Acts* xi. 23, *1 Cor.* i. 4. It is specially and frequently applied by St. Paul to his own ministry in connection with that admission of the Gentiles, for example, *1 Cor.* iii. 10, xv. 10, *Rom.* i. 5, xii. 3, xv. 15. And the Apostle emphasises the difference between it and "debt" and natural "works," as St. Augustine will lay stress on the distinction between it and free will.

Eph. i. 6b. Sanctification

To election, predestination and adoption, another blessing is added in the gift of the grace, which makes us gracious in the sense of being pleasing to God. Therefore, having mentioned God's grace, St. Paul at once adds,

**Eph. i. 6b. With which He made us gracious
In the Beloved.**

The pronoun, rendered "with which," is indeed in the genitive, according to the older manuscripts. But that is due to the genitive, "of His grace," which precedes. This has attracted the relative pronoun into the genitive form from a dative, or more probably from an accusative, as the dative does not seem subject to attraction in the Greek Testament.

As to the verb, it means "to make gracious," as a verb of similar termination means "to make a slave." In *Sirach*, it is asked,

Ecclus. xviii. 17. Behold, is not a word beyond a good gift?
And both are with a man, who has been made
gracious.

Again, the verb is used of our Blessed Lady in St. Luke's version of the Angelic Salutation,

Luke i. 28. Hail, thou, who hast been made gracious.

Here, the Syriac Vulgate confirms the Latin by its "full of grace," and enables us to find what Aramaic expression most probably underlay St. Luke's Greek translation.

Such a mode of expression as

. . . His grace
With which He made us gracious,

or "graced us," or "endued us with grace," is very emphatic, and finds parallels in

Eph. i. 19. According to the activity of the might of His strength,
20. With which He was active in the Messiah ;

Eph. ii. 4b. On account of His much love,
[With] which He loved us ;

Eph. iv. 1. Of the calling, with which you were called ;

and

- 2 Cor. i. 4. By means of the consolation,
With which we ourselves are being consoled.

In the present passage, we are plainly not dealing with such graces as those of working miracles, which are given to a man in trust for others, and do not of themselves make him more pleasing to God. But we are dealing with such a grace, as makes a man gracious and pleasing before God. Of such graces, there are some, such as the Divine Law, or the example of our Lord, which affect the man externally and extrinsically ; and there are others also, which affect a man's actions. None of these can be in question, but something deeper and richer still, for God has used it to make us gracious in the Beloved. Therefore, it is a lasting quality, infused into us, not a passing assistance or stimulus. It is that sanctifying grace, by which a man is made just and placed in a state of friendship with God.

Since this is so unique a grace, St. Paul employs a unique name, the Beloved, for Him, in whom it is given to us. In the parallel passage of the *Epistle to the Colossians*, the title is "the Son of His Love." There, speaking of the Father, St. Paul said,

- Col. i. 13. Who rescued us out of the authority of the darkness,
And removed [us] into the kingdom of the Son of His
Love,

14. In whom we have the redemption,
The remission of the sins.

Of the two Greek words, *ēgapēmenos*, the perfect participle, "having been loved," and *agapētos* "loved," or "lovable," both being rendered "beloved," the latter is found several times in the Gospels. It is argued by Armitage Robinson, in his *Commentary*, p. 231, that St. Matthew's substitution

of it for "the Elect," in his quotation, xii. 18, from *Isaiah* xlii. 1, shows he regarded "the Beloved" as a distinct title. This is confirmed both by the parallelism of

Matt. iii. 17. This is My Son (Ps. ii. 7),

The Beloved, in whom I was well pleased (Is. xlii. 1),

and by the Old Syriac, which renders the Greek phrase in every case save one as "My Son and My Beloved." It was the easier for the title to become a Messianic one, as it was used for an only child, *Gen.* xxii. 2, 12, 16. As such a Messianic title, it is characteristic of the "Vision," cc. vi-xi., in the *Ascension of Isaiah*, that portion being written soon after Domitian's accession in 81 A.D.

The other word for "Beloved," *ēgapēmenos*, "having been loved," is found in our present passage, and is used of Israel in the Greek Vulgate. Sometimes it renders "Jeshurun," *Deut.* xxxii. 15, xxxiii. 5, 26, *Isaiah*, xliv. 2, and sometimes *yādīd* "beloved." Like "Servant" and "Elect," it was transferred from Israel to the Messiah. At least so we argue from its application to the Messiah in such passages as *Barnabas* iii. 6, iv. 3, 8, written at Alexandria between 70 and 79 A.D., the inscription in the epistle of St. Ignatius *to the Smyrnaeans*, written in 115 A.D., the *Acts of Paul and Thekla*, i., which is a second century edition of a first century document, and the *Paedagogus*, or "Tutor," I. vi. 25, written before 195 by St. Clement, head of the Alexandrian School from 189 to 202. It is reasonably argued that all such passages are not dependent on *Eph.* i. 6, and therefore imply an independent tendency to make Israel's title, "Beloved," a name of the Messiah.

Some witnesses add "His Son" to the word "Beloved"; but the phrase is clearly a gloss, though a correct one. It was not in the Peshitta Syriac, in 411, nor in the

text of the Harclean Syriac, in 616. We find it in Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., in its copy, Sangerman E, of Cent. ix., and in two other Western manuscripts of the same century, Augien F and its twin, Boernerian G. But in these, it appears to have entered the Greek column from the Latin one. It is most probable that the Gothic version also derived it from a Latin source. Victorinus and Ambrosiaster, both of Rome and about 360, have it ; and St. Jerome says distinctly that it is found in the Latin manuscripts, Vallarsi's *St. Jerome*, vii. 552c. As the Latin Vulgate of the Epistles, in 385 A.D., was really a modified form of the Old Latin, we naturally find it in the Vulgate manuscripts, though not in the original form of Codex Amiatinus. But in 388 A.D., St. Jerome, in his commentary on this passage, definitely rejected that phrase, " which is contained in the Latin manuscripts " ; and we may certainly hold it for a Latin gloss.

Eph. i. 7. Redemption

To election, predestination, adoption, and sanctification, we are now taught to add redemption. Happily, the mention of the Beloved has given the Apostle his theme, for it is the Beloved,

**Eph. i. 7. In whom we have the redemption
By means of His Blood.**

And then to define the redemption and its fulness, St. Paul adds

**Eph. i. 7c. The remission of lapses
According to the wealth of His grace.**

So, at this point, sin and the penalty for sin interrupt the development of the Eternal Counsel. The Fall intervenes ;

and He, in whom we were selected, predetermined, adopted and sanctified, must now become our priest and sacrifice to save us by the offering of His own Blood. That oblation spoke of a surrendered life, for as the Mosaic Law taught, *Gen.* ix. 4, *Lev.* xvii. 11, 14, and *Deut.* xii. 23, the blood represented the soul and the life.

The spiritual order, instituted by God, had been violated. And there must now be the acknowledgment of God's supreme dominion, the vindication of the interrupted design, and the restoration of the harmony. The shedding of blood confessed God as Lord of life and death. Suffering made satisfaction for the sins. And merit won back the graces lost. Some confusion has been introduced into the question by the way in which the word "Atonement," used in 1611 for at-one-ment, reconciliation and restoration, came before 1911 to mean reparation and satisfaction.

Reparation is indeed one element in the question. And as this question was concerned with the sin, it had regard to deliverance from the penalty and the bond of sin. Therefore, in this epistle, St. Paul defines the redemption by the unique phrase,

Eph. i. 7. The remission of lapses,

as he has just defined it in the *Epistle to the Colossians* as

Col. i. 14. The remission of the sins.

There are, it is well known, various names for sin, each emphasising some special feature of it. Among these, the Hebrew *chattā'th* and the Greek *hamartia* are generally rendered "sin," and imply a missing the mark, an error. The Hebrew *péssha'* and the Greek *parábasis* mean "transgression," and imply rebellion in the violation of a law. In the present passage, sin is regarded as a fall, a lapse, the

word being perfectly appropriate in a context, which was indicating the lofty line of human life in the counsel of God.

For the moment, we are not regarding the need of manifesting God's dominion, which has been transgressed, or the restoration of the harmony, which has been broken. We are concerned only with man as a sinner, and ask how he may be delivered from his sin. We are looking at the negative aspect, forgiveness, not at the positive, reconciliation. Yet whatever word we may use may mislead us by its metaphorical associations. If we speak of ransom and redemption, the very figure of speech may betray us, as it betrayed St. Irenaeus, *Heresies*, v. i., and many others into supposing a ransom paid to Satan, as if the rebel spirit had rights over us against God. No doubt, the Greek word *apo-lútrōsis*, "redemption," is used to signify deliverance simply. In the Greek Vulgate, it is only found in *Dan.* iv. 30, where the words "my time of the redemption came" are used by Nebuchadnezzar of his own recovery. Nor can we easily make the word mean more than deliverance in the injunction,

Luke xxi. 28. Look up and lift up your heads,
Because your redemption nears;

or in the explanation of the completed adoption as "the redemption of the body," *Rom.* viii. 23, or in the account of those who were "bastinadoed, not accepting deliverance," *Heb.* xi. 35. Indeed, Armitage Robinson, in his excellent commentary on this epistle, p. 147, suggests the word "emancipation" as a better translation than "redemption."

St. Paul checks one expression by another, that of *apo-lútrōsis*, "redemption," by the phrase, "by means of His Blood," implying sacrifice, and also by the word *áphesis*, "remission," "sending away," "discharge," "forgiveness." But indeed, in a matter which involves so many elements

and so many spiritual relations, not all the metaphors to be drawn from the visible world could do more than offer a rushlight illumination of spatial depths. Even the question of satisfaction alone involves the nature and effects of sin, our Lord's divine nature, His vicarious sacrifice and priesthood, as well as the deathless love and infinite justice of God in providing and accepting that Sacrifice.

Since the Redemption, as well as the Eternal Counsel, had its source in the resources of God's grace and bounty, St. Paul, who so frequently uses the word "wealth" of God's grace and glory, speaks of the redemption and the remission as given fully and abundantly,

Eph. i. 7. According to the wealth of His grace.

Eph. i. 8, 9d. The Messianic Prophecies.

So far the blessings have had regard to our state, as that of souls, selected, predestined, adopted, sanctified and redeemed. Now St. Paul passes to the gift of a Divine Revelation, by which men have been taken into fellowship with God in His Eternal Purpose. Therefore, having mentioned God's grace, he continues,

**Eph. i. 8. Which [grace] He caused to abound unto us
In every [form of] wisdom and prudence.**

We have rendered the verb as "He caused to abound." Some may argue that it generally means, "He abounded," and that we should render the line,

Which He abounded in unto us,

especially as the relative is in the genitive. But we can explain that form of the relative as due to the preceding genitive "of grace," which has attracted the relative into its own form. And St. Paul uses the verb in the sense of

“causing to abound” in 1 *Thess.* iii. 12 and 2 *Cor.* ix. 8. In the latter passage, we read

2 *Cor.* ix. 8. But God can cause every grace to abound unto you, the words resembling our present passage in more than form.

As we cannot well say

In every wisdom and prudence,

we render the line

In every [form of] wisdom and prudence.

Before considering these words, “wisdom” and “prudence,” we may read the next lines, as they indicate the time in which God caused His grace so to abound. It was

**Eph. i. 9a. When He made known to us
The mystery of His Will.**

We have rendered an aorist or indefinite past participle by “when He made known,” as we translated another in *Eph.* i. 5, by “when He pre-determined.” So doing, we preserved the indefiniteness of the time and the definiteness of the act as done once for all.

Presently, St. Paul will tell us of God’s will to summarise all things in the Christ, and of Israel’s place in God’s counsel. Then he will treat of the Gentiles. So the verses we are examining would take their place in the order of the argument as representing the burden of Old Testament prophecy. Already, the first person plural, which has stood for all the redeemed, is beginning to denote Israelites. As the Choice, the Predestination, the Adoption, and the Sanctification spoke of the Eternal Counsel, and the Redemption was connected with the Fall of Man, so the Revelation now

represents the stream of prophecy, which flowed from Eden to Malachi.

If we now look at the words "wisdom" and "prudence," their sense will be plainer. God's grace, when He revealed the secret purpose of His will, abounded in every form of wisdom and prudence, wisdom referring to intellectual, and prudence to practical excellence. It has been objected that such words cannot be applied to God; but they certainly are most apt to describe the way chosen to unfold the future Messiah and His kingdom. For Messianic prophecy was an organic growth in ever richer harmony with the Divine purpose and in ever closer adaptation to the needs of men. Indeed, we might paraphrase these lines of St. Paul by the opening words of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*,

Heb. i. 1. Multi-partially and multi-modally of old,
God, [having] spoken to the fathers in the prophets.

The many parts or pieces of the truth implied the wisdom, which had conceived the complete scheme, as the many modes of communication involved prudence in adapting the revelation to the needs and capacities of men.

True it is that such words are inadequate in respect of God, but we only apply them, and such terms as "Father" and "Son," "Love" and "Light," to express an analogy, and to serve as poor and feeble symbols of the truth. Surely, we must employ such expressions, when we would tell how God has in a temporal world taught finite men the Mystery or Divine secret, which His will had in an eternal world chosen from all possible alternatives for realisation. Language must be broken in the effort to express such themes; but the themes are not lost for the mind that looks through the broken language to the meaning it would convey.

With regard to the word "mystery," Menander and Cicero use it for a secret. The former, in a fragment, forbids us to tell our mystery to a friend; and the latter, writing to *Atticus* iv. 18, does not employ a secretary, as the letters contain so many mysteries. The Greek Vulgate employs the word in the same sense in *Judith* ii. 2, *Tobit* xii. 7, 11, 2 *Maccabees* xiii. 21, *Sirach* xxii. 22, xxvii. 16, 17, 21, and *Wisdom* vi. 22. The same usage is followed by Theodotion in *Psalms* xxv. 14, *Proverbs* xx. 19, and *Daniel* ii. 18, 19, 27, 29, and by Symmachus in *Proverbs* xi. 13. In *Wisdom* xiv. 15, 23, however, the word is transferred from ordinary secrets to the pagan rites, their ritual acts or ritual objects, which were concealed from the uninitiated. It would appear that the word "mysteries," in this sense, is first found in *Herodotus* ii. 51.

In the Greek Testament, the word is generally used of a truth, revealed by God. We cannot say that the volume is anticipated in this by the *Book of Enoch*, which in several places, for example, viii. 3, ix. 6, x. 7, xvi. 3, written soon after 170 B.C., used the word "mysteries" in its Greek version for knowledge, communicated by fallen angels to the daughters of men. For the New Testament uses the word to imply a divine secret, divinely revealed. This employment of the word is characteristic of the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, where it is found in i. 9, iii. 3, 4, 9, v. 32, and vi. 19. And it corresponds to the use of the Hebrew word, *sôdh*, "counsel," in

Amos. iii. 7. For my Lord Jehovah will not do a thing
Unless He has revealed His counsel
To His servants, the prophets.

In the *Apocalypse*, the word means such a divine secret. It is applied also to the divine meaning of the seven stars, i. 20, and of the Woman on the Beast, xvii. 7, as well as to

the name "Babylon," as involving a divine secret in its inner meaning, xvii. 5. And it is also used of the prophetic revelation, which unveiled a divine secret, x. 7.

It is evidently impossible for us to discuss the Messianic Prophecies at this moment. But we may recall three, which lie at the basis of the Apostle's argument, and prepare us for the next step of his argument. The first of these is

- Gen. i. 26. And God said,
 " We will make Man,
 " In our image,
 " According to our likeness,
 " And they will subdue the fish of the sea
 " And the fowl of the heavens
 " And the beast
 " And all the earth
 " And every crawling thing
 " That is crawling upon the earth."

That universal dominion of man is taken up again in *Psalm* viii., where it is connected with the Ideal Man.

- Ps. viii. 7. Thou didst cause Him to rule over the works of Thy
 hands ;
 Thou hast put everything under His feet—
 8. Flock and oxen—all of them,
 And also the beasts of [the] field,
 9. The bird of [the] heavens
 And the fishes of [the] sea—
 [He, the Man] crossing the paths of [the] sea !

And in *Psalm* ii., the Ideal Man is definitely presented as the Messiah.

Ps. ii. 7. My Son [art] Thou :
I begot Thee, this day.

8. Ask from Me ;
And I will give

Nations [as] Thy possession,
And the ends of [the] earth [as] Thy seizure.

i. 9b, 10. The Messianic Purpose.

Now, having mentioned the Mystery, or Divine secret, the purpose of God's will, St. Paul unfolds its contents, saying,

Eph. i. 9b. According to His good pleasure,
Which He [God] purposed in Him [Christ]

10. Unto a stewardship of the fulness of the
seasons—

To summarise all the things for Himself in
the Christ—

The things upon the heavens
And the things over the earth—in Him—

It was necessary to read the six lines together, in order to note that the phrase " in Him " at the end of the second line is repeated at the end of the sixth, where it clearly refers to our Blessed Lord. At the same time, it is evident that He who purposed, proposed, or set before Himself, His own good pleasure, that is, what seemed good to Himself, is God the Father. But for a moment, we perhaps do not see the reference of the word, rendered " according to." It cannot refer to the making known, for that was not the

purpose, the good pleasure, to be realised in the Messiah or Christ. But it has regard to the mystery of God's will, for that is explained now as the good pleasure of God.

That good pleasure, which God set before himself for realisation in the Messiah, is also explained. First of all, it is an economy, an administration, or a stewardship, which has the fulness of the seasons for its province. The Messiah was intended by God to be steward and administrator of what is described as the fulness of the seasons. Twelve years earlier, writing to the Galatians, iv. 4, St. Paul had described the Messianic period as the fulness of the time, the complement and fulfilment of the expectant era. Now, by a slight change, he describes that era as a series of seasons or epochs, as by-and-by, in *Eph.* iii. 5, he will see it in the form of generations.

To explain the stewardship of the Messiah in the Messianic period, St. Paul adds a parallel line with another figure :

Eph. i. 10b. To summarise all the things for Himself in the Christ.

So he presents God's purpose as the summarising, the recapitulating "all the things" for Himself in the Messiah, as one would take all the chief points of a theme, one by one, and then present them all together as one whole. The Old Syriac, to judge from Ephraem's *Commentary* of about 373 A.D., suggests, and the *Peshittâ* or Syriac Vulgate of 411 implies, that the verb means "renew from the beginning." The Latin Vulgate of 385 also renders it "renew"; but it is explained as "recapitulate" by Tertullian of Carthage about 200 A.D., and by St. Irenaeus according to the Latin translation, made of his works, about 200, or as Westcott and Hort argue, in the fourth century. The Syriac and the Latin, however, must not be held erroneous,

In such a case as this, recapitulation or summarisation under a Divine Person implies a restoration and renewal. The elevation of Jews and Gentiles to the supernatural order, and the formation of an harmonious universe, must certainly in view of sin be a redemptive and restorative process.

Four years ago, St. Paul in his *Epistle to the Romans*, xiii. 9, had taken the Commandments one by one, and "summarised" them in the direction to love one's neighbour. So interpreting the verb in our present passage, we retain each of its elements, the prefix *ana* implying "one by one," the noun, *kephálaion*, meaning a heading or chief point, as in *Heb.* viii. 1, and the middle or reflexive form of the verb suggesting that God does this "for Himself."

All things must be so summarised. But the Greek word for "all things" has the article, and therefore means "all the things in one," as a whole. And lest anything should seem exempted from Messiah's jurisdiction by Colossian adoration of angels, *Col.* i. 16, ii. 18, 19, or by the adoration of Nero in the Roman Empire, the Apostle explains "all the things" as

Eph. i. 10c. The things upon the heavens
And the things over the earth.

Then to emphasise the position of the Messiah as the Head, the Centre, even the sphere of "all the things," the Apostle repeats the phrase, "in Him."

***Eph.* i. 11, 12. The Messianic Kingdom**

The Messianic purpose of God was not frustrated. Not utterly in vain were the privileges of the Israelites in regard to the adoption of their nation as God's firstborn son, *Exod.* iv. 22, the glory of God's presence in the Shekhînah, *Exod.* xvi. 10, the covenants from time to time renewing the

Covenant between God and Israel, the Mosaic legislation, the Temple worship, the Messianic promises, the merits of the patriarchs, and the Incarnation of God. These were continually present to St. Paul, as when he enumerated them in his *Epistle to the Romans*, ix. 4, 5.

Now the Apostle, having told of the Divine purpose regarding the Messiah, adds

Eph. i. 11. In whom we were also allotted [to God],
When we were pre-determined [to Israel's
position],

According to the purpose of Him, who is
active in 'all the things,'
According to the counsel of His will—

12. Unto the [end] that we be unto praise of His
glory,—
[We] who have fore-hoped in the Christ.

As to the last phrase, it would be well to substitute the Hebrew title, "Messiah," for the Greek word, "Christ." Neither the latter, nor the English word, "Anointed," carries quite the same associations, as the word, which became charged with the hopes of Abraham's children for two thousand years. And again we note that the Greek word for "all things" has the article to imply "all the things in one."

The Apostle has just spoken of all things as destined to be summarised in the Messiah. He must now deal with Jewish privileges; for the Jews were not only to be summarised with all other creatures, but they had also been appointed to a special position, indicated, for example, in

Deut. xxxii. 9 For the lot of Jehovah is His people :
Jacob is the portion of His possession,

As it were, Jehovah's people is that, which is assigned to Him by lot. And the portion of the possession, measured off for Him, is His people Jacob. This is a bold and fine figure to express Israel's special place in the love and purpose of God. So the Apostle, having represented his own people as summarised with others in the Messiah, hastens to add that they were also specially allotted to God in Him. The verb which we render "allotted" is never used in the Greek Vulgate of the Old Testament, and only here in the Greek text of the New. But the meaning is made plain by its derivation from the Greek noun, *klèros*, "a lot," and by the reference to *Deut.* xxxii. 9. So we have no hesitation in rendering it "assigned by lot," or "allotted."

The words, "when we were pre-determined," or "predestined," represent a Greek participle in aorist or indefinite past time. The Apostle would indicate the special vocation of Israel; but he remembers that he is writing to those, who for the most part are Gentiles. He, who has just written that most courteous and graceful letter to Philemon, shrinks from words, that might seem to belittle his readers, or belaud himself. So he does not define the position, to which Israel was pre-determined, but describes it indefinitely as

Eph. i. 11. According to the purpose of Him, who is active in
'all the things,'

According to the counsel of His will.

It is sufficient, the Apostle seems to say, that the Jews were pre-determined and predestined to occupy the place, designed for them by God, who is active in the whole universe, and moulds everything according to His own deliberate will. The last phrase, "the counsel of His will," is quite clear, though it is found here alone in the Greek Testament. There is much emphasis in the supplementing

the word "will" by the word "counsel," the latter suggesting deliberation, as the adverbial phrase "according to [the] purpose," that is, "purposely," also does. But St. Paul speaks anthropomorphically. And he seems to be the first writer to use this word "purpose" of God, Aristotle, in his *Rhetoric*, iii. 13, written after 338 B.C., using it of the "proposition" or expository section in a speech, and others of a plan.

Of course, it could not be supposed for a moment that God's Will, which is one with His Divine Essence, could proceed by deliberation, but the Apostle would guard against the unuttered suspicion, that Israel's place was due to caprice or arbitrary choice. Therefore, St. Paul suggests the Divine motive. But he does so indefinitely and without wounding Gentile susceptibilities. He simply says that the Jews, who had been the first to hope in the Messiah, and had watched for Him in spite of darkness, that could be felt, should be to the praise of God's glory. Already, the Apostle had pointed out that the predestination to adoption was to the praise of the glory of God's grace, *Eph.* i. 6. So we may note that the predestined position is primarily for the manifestation of God's glory; but the predestined adoption, primarily for the manifestation of His grace.

With regard to the word, rendered "fore-hoped," it has been questioned whether it means "hoped before Messiah came," or "hoped before others hoped." The latter sense is suggested by the context, which contrasts Jews and Gentiles. And it is confirmed by the use of the prefix *pro-*, "fore-," in

1 Cor. xi. 21. For each fore-takes his own supper,

that is, takes it before the others take theirs.

It has been suggested that the "we" in i. 12, should be interpreted of Jewish converts, and the "you" in i. 13, of Gentiles. But the "we" and the "you" appear to be representative, because the Apostle is speaking, i. 11, as he spoke in *Rom.* iii. 1-4, ix. 1-7, of Israel's peculiar privileges. It would hardly be consistent with the theme of this encyclical to draw a contrast between Jewish and Gentile converts, simply as such. For it proposes to shew the union of Jews and Gentiles without any distinction in the one Messiah; and both belong to the same Messianic or Christian Israel, *Eph.* ii. 13-16.

Eph. i. 13, 14. The Messianic Ingathering of the Gentiles.

But the Apostle of the Gentiles must pass on swiftly to the privileges of the Gentile converts. These indeed had not believed in the Messiah before His appearing; but now they were fulfilling what prophets had foretold as to a stream of pilgrims to the spiritual Zion, *Micah* iv. 1, *Isaiah* ii. 2. So St. Paul turns quickly to these, and says,

Eph. i. 13. In whom you also—

There is no verb, and the utterance is broken off. Of the Jews, he was able to say,

Eph. i. 11. In whom we were also allotted [to God].

But now the verb "allotted" would be out of place. Yet he would say all he can for these Gentiles, even concluding his account of them, as he had concluded his account of the Jews, with the words,

Eph. i. 12, i. 14. Unto praise of His glory.

So he will say,

**Eph. i. 13. When you heard the word of truth,
The Gospel of your salvation—**

Again, we render a Greek participle of aorist or indefinite past time by a phrase, "when you heard." The "word of truth," the word which unfolds the truth, is clearly defined by the parallel and unique expression, "the Gospel of your salvation," that is, the Gospel which unfolds your salvation. St. James, i. 18, about twenty-one years ago, and St. Paul himself, five years ago, in 2 *Cor.* vi. 7, have already used the phrase, "word of truth." But in neither case has either word the article, which is found with both words in the present passage.

Now St. Paul resumes the phrase, "in whom you also," saying,

**Eph. i. 13. In whom also, when you believed, you were
sealed
With the Spirit of the promise, the Holy [One].**

The expression, "when you believed," represents the same Greek participle, which the Apostle had used in October, 53, when he asked about twelve men,

Acts xix. 2. If you received [the] Holy Spirit, when you believed.

In the lines we are studying, it would be grammatically possible to render the first as

Eph. i. 13a. In which [Gospel] also, when you believed
[in it], you were sealed.

But to connect belief and the Gospel here, as in *Mark* ii. 15, would be to overlook the initial phrase, "in whom you

also," and the broken character of the sentence. Besides, it would have no parallel in St. Paul's epistles, and would miss the dominant note of the whole passage, this being found in the phrase "in Christ," and not in the words "in the Gospel." Like the other blessings of election, predestination, adoption, sanctification, redemption and enlightenment, the sealing of the soul with the Holy Spirit is given "in Christ."

We cannot explain the metaphor of sealing by the pagan mysteries, for there the seal was silence, the seal of the lips. Nor has it any apparent connection with such customs as the branding a man with an ivy-leaf in honour of Dionysius, 3 *Macc.* ii. 29. St. Paul seems to have borrowed the figure from daily business. In the autumn of 55, he addressed the Corinthians, I. ix. 2, as the seal of his apostleship, because they, as his converts, authenticated his office. In the next year, 56, he writes again to the Corinthians, and speaks of God,

2 Cor. i. 22. Who also sealed us,
And gave the earnest [-money] of the Spirit
In our hearts.

In the January of 57, he wrote to the Romans from Corinth, and used the figure in two remarkable passages. In the former, *Rom.* iv. 11, Abraham is said to have received a sign, that is, circumcision, as a seal of the supernatural justice, into which he had already entered by faith. Circumcision was therefore a seal to authenticate his condition. So to-day, God is blessed at the circumcision of a Jewish boy, because He has sealed the children [of Isaac] with the sign of a holy covenant. In the latter passage, *Rom.* xv. 28, St. Paul speaks of sealing certain fruit to the poor Christians at Jerusalem. He will give them the alms of the Macedonian and Achæan churches. Those alms are the

fruit of a partnership, to which the Jewish Christians contributed spiritual things ; and the Gentile Christians, carnal things. St. Paul, as the commissioned agent of the two will formally convey the alms from the one partner to the other. To use a phrase now current, he will sign, seal and deliver the goods on behalf of the Gentiles. So that the sealing means the authentication of the transaction, though it is only a figurative way of describing St. Paul's own verbal confirmation.

Therefore, in speaking of the sealing with the Holy Spirit of promise, St. Paul simply means that the Holy Spirit, not only sanctifies the Christian, and enables him to perform acts of supernatural faith, hope and love ; but is also an authentic proof, a seal, that such a man is God's property and possession. And the Holy Spirit is described as " the Spirit of the promise " in view of such prophecies as those of *Joel* ii. 29, and of our Lord, *John* xiv. 26, who, after His Resurrection, described the Holy Spirit as " the Promise of My Father," *Luke* xxiv. 49, *Acts* i. 4.

The language of metaphor is natural to the Oriental. Not long ago, a traveller in Palestine pointed to the gap in a sheepfold, and asked where was the door. The shepherd replied, " I am the door " ; because he lay down in the gap at night ; and the words fell naturally from his lips. So when our Lord passed on the night of the Betrayal from the Supper Room across the Temple court on His way to Gethsemane, He pointed to the Golden Vine, the symbol of Israel, on the Porch of the Sanctuary, and said, " I am the true Vine," *John* xv. 1, x. 9. But no doubt, the language of metaphor, like the language of symbol in the *Apocalypse*, breaks under the strain imposed upon it. We may recall how the " Word of God," in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* iv. 12, 13, changes its reference from the written to the living Word. And in the present passage, as in that

we quoted from 2 *Cor.* i. 22, the figure begins with the Christian as the possession, and ends with him as the possessor. Had St. Paul been an amateur essayist, no doubt he could have written out his meaning in full without incurring the adverse criticism of grammatical quibblers ; but we should have lost that sense of condensed energy and swift intensity, which announce the presence of a sincere man.

Now, as we have noted, St. Paul pictures the Christian as waiting for the full possession, and as endowed meanwhile with the Holy Spirit in earnest of what is to come. The earnest is part-payment, and differs from the full payment in quantity, not in quality. Therefore, the Holy Spirit shows the nature of the full payment and full possession in the life and graces which He communicates to the soul. So St. Paul writes of the Holy Spirit, as of Him,

Eph. i. 14. Who is earnest of our possession

Unto redemption of the acquisition—
Unto praise of His glory.

The word for “earnest” is *arrhābōn*, a Semitic word. It is used by the Greek Vulgate in *Gen.* xxxviii. 17, and there alone, for the Hebrew *‘ērābhôn*, from *‘ārābh*, “to entwine,” or “pledge.” It seems to have been made known to the Greeks by Phœnician traders ; and so it appeared in Aristotle and the later Greek classics. From Greek it passed to classical Latin as *arrhabo* ; thence to later Latin as *arrha* or *arra*, and to French as *arrhes*, money paid in striking a bargain. Only in the Greek Vulgate of *Gen.* xxxviii. 17, to which we have just referred, does it mean a pledge. Elsewhere, it means an earnest, and indeed a large part of the payment.

The word, which we have rendered “possession,” is generally translated “inheritance.” But neither the

Hebrew verbs *yārāsh* and *nāchāl*, nor the Aramaic verbs, *y'rath* and *'achsēn*, for which St. Paul and other Hellenist Jews employed it, implied possession by inheritance; Dalman, *Words*, 125, 126. And with regard to the word, which we represent by "acquisition," we cannot limit it to purchase, or any other particular mode of acquisition.

Then, as the Holy Spirit is God's seal, He is also our earnest. And though the noun "Spirit" is neuter in Greek, the relative pronoun "who" is masculine. Possibly, the pronoun is drawn into the masculine gender of the word *arrhābōn*, "earnest," which follows it, *Gal.* iii. 16, offering us a similar example. But the masculine form of the relative may express the personality of the Divine Spirit, suggested by the title "the Holy [One]."

Now the Holy Spirit is our earnest

Eph. i. 14b. Unto redemption of the acquisition.

That is to say, He is part-payment unto [the time of the] redemption, and until the acquisition has been redeemed in full. In the parallelism, "acquisition" corresponds to "possession," and "redemption" to "earnest." No doubt, the word for "acquisition" comes from a verb, which means to "preserve alive." It would therefore naturally mean "survival," as in the Greek Vulgate of 2 *Chron.* xiv. 13. But in the middle or reflexive form, the verb means "to acquire for oneself"; and so the noun means "acquisition" on its four occurrences in the Greek Testament, 1 *Thess.* v. 9, 2 *Thess.* ii. 14, *Heb.* x. 39, and the present place. There is no difficulty with regard to the word, rendered "redemption," for it is evident that the word is used here of the full realisation in the future, as it was employed in *Eph.* i. 7, of that already accomplished on the Cross and in the forgiveness of our sins.

St. Paul, therefore, simply means that the Holy Spirit is our present pledge, until the day when we are able to enter into full and free possession of all that God holds in store for us, Gentiles. That too, like the position of the Jews, will be

Eph. i. 14c. Unto praise of His glory.

For it is His own glory, that is manifest and resplendent in those whom He honours. However great the treasure they possess, they themselves are only earthenware vessels, 2 Cor. iv. 7, like the broken jugs, in which Gideon's three hundred men held the victorious lights, *Judges*, vii. 20.

Eph. i. 15, 16. The Messianic or Christian Spirit.

After so magnificent a theme and so impetuous a chant, had there been the least duplicity or the least morbid self-consciousness in St. Paul, it would almost inevitably have betrayed him. But the reaction is beautiful, for St. Paul had really been near God in that great sweep of thought and language, and he remains near God in his simplicity. Commenting on this epistle in his *Synopsis*, iv. 375, Darby, the Plymouth Brother, said with fine instinct that nearness to God produces simplicity, and enables us in simplicity to enjoy the blessings of God, as God Himself bestows them, as they flow from His heart, in all their own excellence. It is very true. And while we scheme and work, it is only God and great saints and little children, who can play. So the natural gentleness and chivalry, the playfulness and utter courtesy of St. Paul, implied a capacity for such Divine Inspiration, as would unveil the heights and depths disclosed in this wonderful epistle.

Now, in the rhythm of its own life and energy, his spirit

becomes quiet. He has just reminded his readers, how they had believed, and were sealed. Now he adds,

Eph. i. 15. On account of this, I also—

When I heard of the faith among you in the
Lord Jesus
And the love, the [love] unto all the holy
[ones]—

16. I do not cease giving thanks on behalf of you,
Making mention in my prayers.

The speech is broken. Those words, “I also,” can hardly mean that St. Paul, as well as others, does something. They stand in contrast to the phrase, “in whom you also,” and therefore imply “I, on the other hand,” “for my part.” The phrase, “when I heard,” represents an aorist or indefinite past participle, and certainly suggests that some at least of the readers were stranger than the Ephesians to St. Paul.

In the last couplet,

Eph. i. 16. I do not cease giving thanks on behalf of you,
Making mention in my prayers,

the word for “giving thanks,” *eucharistōn*, originally meant to be gracious and to do graciously, and afterwards came to mean the returning such favour by deed or gratitude. It has been questioned, whether the words “making mention” mean remembering simply, or such an explicit mention as that to be heard in all Christian congregations. Certainly, the words are used in the sense of such explicit mention in the Attic Greek of Plato’s *Protagoras*, 317 E, and *Phaedo*, 254 A. They are found in the same sense in

the Hellenist Greek rendering of *Psalm* cxi. 4, the Hebrew signifying

Ps. cxi. 4. He made a memorial for His wonderful [works].

And as Armitage Robinson points out in his *Commentary*, p. 37, a papyrus letter in the British Museum, written by a young woman to her brother, and dated July 24, 172 B.C., tells how the writer is "continually making mention of" the reader, and how she had "thanked the gods" for his welfare.

It is always worth while to determine the exact words by textual criticism and their exact meaning by lexical criticism. But to understand a passage, we must possess the principle implied in it. A man does not really understand the formulæ of the straight line, circle, ellipse, parabola and hyperbola, unless he has grasped them in their relation to the general formulæ of the conic section. In this connection, we may recall that our Lord said to the Jews,

John viii. 43. Why do you not know the speech, the [speech that is] mine?

[It is] because you cannot hear the word, the [word that is] mine.

They could not perceive the meaning of His different utterances, because they could not attain the principle, which illuminated all He said. So men, who cannot see the light, cannot perceive what the light illumines.

We have sought the meaning of St. Paul's words. In these verses of the encyclical, we have found that thanksgiving for his readers' faith and love, with which he had begun his epistles to the *Thessalonians* I. i. 3, II. i. 3, *Romans* i. 8, *Philemon* 5, and *Colossians* i. 4, 5. Utter simplicity, faith, love, thanksgiving and prayer,—these are essential to piety of any form. But to understand them

in their Pauline form, we must read them in the light of the Pauline principle. And for this, we need to grasp the whole Pauline presentation of the Messianic spirit.

No doubt, true faith rests in our Lord, as Mary sat at His feet, *Luke* x. 39. The love, of which St. Paul sang in *1 Cor.* xiii., is such as embraces all God's family.

1 John iv. 20. For he, who does not love his brother, whom he
has seen,
Cannot love God, whom he has not seen.

The thanksgiving ascends from earth to heaven as the expression of a soul, whose supernatural life is that of God the Holy Ghost, and therefore so intertwined, and more than intertwined, with the lives of his fellows, that no jealousy or envy is awakened by their good. And in his prayer, such a soul becomes another Christ, as Tertullian boldly names the true Christian, in mediating between the visible earth and the invisible heaven, and in enriching the lives of others.

These indicate the Messianic or Christian spirit in their different ways ; but to know the essence of that spirit, we must pass on to the Pauline principle and the Pauline perspective, as we shall find these in the Pauline prayer, and in the doxology, which follows it.

Eph. i. 15. A Disputed Reading, " the love."

Before proceeding further in exegesis, it will be necessary to consider a question of textual criticism. We read in

Eph. i. 15. When I heard of the faith among you in the Lord Jesus
And the love, the [love] unto all the holy [ones].

If we omit the words, " the love," the sense of the passage will be greatly altered, and the report will be of faith in our Lord and unto the saints. But the words are omitted by

certain witnesses. These include not only the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, both probably of Caesarea and the year 331, but also the Alexandrian A, of the fifth century. We must add too the Porphyrian uncial P of the ninth century, and the cursive 17 of the ninth or tenth. So we may say that the Neutral or Critical or Early Alexandrian Text, omits the words.

Cramer, in 1842, in his *Caténæ*, or series of quotations from the Greek Fathers in explanation of the New Testament, quoted Origen, on this passage, p. 129, showing that the head of the Alexandrian School, from 203 to 231, omitted the words. To Origen's omission, we may attribute St. Jerome's omission of the words in commenting on this verse, for St. Jerome's commentary in 388 on this epistle owes very much to Origen. It is also to Origen's omission, that we may trace the Alexandrian Cyril's in his work *on the Trinity*, p. 603, written between 417 and 428. And it is by St. Jerome's omission, we may explain St. Augustine's in his treatise *on the Predestination of the Saints*, xix. 39, written in 428 in the Pelagian Controversy.

The testimonies of St. Jerome, St. Cyril and St. Augustine are not only traceable to Origen, but they are also contradicted by the witnesses themselves. For St. Jerome inserts the words in his Latin Vulgate of 385, that version of the Pauline epistles, however, being a form of the Old Latin. The Alexandrian Cyril has them with a slight misplacement in his commentary on *St. John*, p. 838. And St. Augustine quotes them in his *Letters*, ccxvii. 28.

There is so much in favour of the words, that it may well give us pause before falling into awestruck silence in the presence of the Neutral Text. Even if we concede that it has best preserved the original text, yet the frailty of copyists and cumulative evidence from other sources may require us to abandon a Neutral reading.

In the present case, the words are supported by the Western text, represented in the Claromontanus D of Cent. vi. and the copy of it, the Sangerman E, made in Cent. ix, and in the twin manuscripts, the Augien F and the Boernerian G, both made from one exemplar in Cent. ix. Each of these manuscripts contains also an Old Latin version; and in each case the version contains the words.

The Syrian Text also supports them. They are found in the uncial or half-capital manuscripts, the Moscovian K and the Angelic L, both of the ninth century, and in the Peshîtta or "Simple" Syriac Vulgate of 411, and the Harclean Syriac of 616. They are read by St. Chrysostom, whose commentary on the *Epistle to the Ephesians* was written before his appointment to the see of Constantinople in 398, as Hom. vi. p. 44 A, xi. p. 86, and xiii. p. 44 E, imply Antiochian circumstances. As usual, he is followed by the Syrian Theodoret about 423, and by St. John the Damascene, who flourished between 717 and 741. To these we must add several cursives, generally representing the Syrian Text: 47, 73 and 80 of Cent. xi., 39 and 118 of Cent. xii., 116 of Cent. xiii., and 37 of Cent. xv.

But Egypt and its neighbourhood witness in favour of the words through the Bohairic Version, made in Northern Egypt about 200 or 250, through Euthalius, an Alexandrian deacon, in 458, his commentary on St. Paul's epistles being preserved in a manuscript of 1301, and through the Ethiopic Version, badly made about 600, and revised in Cent. xiv.

These instances are sufficient to show that the words have Western, Syrian and Alexandrian support. And we must not omit explicit mention of such favourable witnesses as Victorinus, at Rome, about 360, the Gothic Version of Ulphilas, made in 341, and affected by the Old Latin in 568, Ambrosiaster, probably the Roman Faustinus, under

Pope Dámasus, 366-384, the Syrian Ephraem, a deacon of Edessa about 373, and the seventh century corrector, Aleph^o or, **Ⲑ**, of the Sinaitic Aleph.

Now we must look at the verse for its own internal evidence. We note that if we omit the words "the love," then we must supply the word "faith" to the article, and render the lines in this way :

When I heard of the faith among you in the Lord Jesus
And the [faith] unto all the holy [ones].

It has been alleged that such an expression is not unexampled in St. Paul ; and we are referred to *Philemon*, 4-6. But there we read,

- Philem. 4. I thank my God always,
Making mention of thee in my prayers,
5. Hearing of thy love
And of the faith, which thou hast,
- Toward the Lord Jesus
And unto all the holy [ones],
6. That the fellowship of thy faith
May become active,
- In full knowledge of every good,
Of the [good] in us unto Christ.

But the fellowship of faith is the social bond in common faith. The object of that faith is not the saints, but our Lord. And in verse 5, "love," "faith," "Lord Jesus," and "holy [ones]" form the figure *chiasmus*, "a crossing" or diagonal arrangement, the letter **X** being formed, if we write "love" and "faith" in one line, and "Lord Jesus" and "holy [ones]" in a line beneath. For primarily, but not exclusively, the faith is connected with our Lord, and the love with His Saints.

Having written that letter to Philemon, St. Paul writes to the Colossians. There the passage in *Philemon* is made clear, for we read

Col. i. 4. When we heard of your faith in Christ Jesus,
And of the love, which you have unto all the holy [ones].

And those words are only adapted to encyclical form, when he dictates as in our verse,

Eph. i. 15. When I heard of the faith among you in the Lord
Jesus,
And of the love, the [love] unto all the holy [ones]:

Besides, we must take into account the tendency of a copyist to omit words, and the ease, with which the eye, on returning to the copy, is caught by the word on its second occurrence, all the intervening words being omitted. Such a source of error is called *homæo-teleuton*, "like-ending," and is sufficiently illustrated in Burgon and Miller's *Causes of Corruption in the Traditional Text*, c. iii. So we may confess it easy for the copyist in the present case to have written the first "the" in the line,

And the love, the unto all the holy [ones],

and turning back to the manuscript, to have been caught by the second "the," and this the more easily as the endings of the three words are similar, *tēn agapēn tēn*, "the love, the." Then the translator, compelled to supply a feminine noun for the feminine article, takes the nearest antecedent, and renders the line,

The [faith] unto all the holy [ones].

Eph. i. 17-19. The First Prayer.

We may speak of the next three verses as St. Paul's "First Prayer" in this encyclical to distinguish it from a

"Second Prayer" in *Eph.* iii. 14-19, and from a "Third Prayer" in *Eph.* vi. 18-20.

The differences between these prayers are very interesting. The First Prayer is an expression of the contemplative spirit, and seeks the enlightenment of the sanctified intellect. Four themes occupy it. In four ways, the soul reaches out into the unfathomable deeps of the supernatural world. It would know God, His call, His possession and His power. It will be necessary to consider these separately.

Eph. i. 17. The Knowledge of God.

Again the pulse rises in the rhythm of St. Paul's soul, as he tells his readers how he prays for them,

i. 17. In order that the God of our Lord, Jesus Christ,
The Father of glory,

Might give you a spirit of wisdom and revelation
In full knowledge of Him.

We note the parallelism, "the Father of glory," answering to "the God of our Lord, Jesus Christ," and "full knowledge of Him" to "a spirit of wisdom and revelation."

With regard to the verbal form "might give," we should expect "may give" after the present tense "making mention." The tense, in any case, is second aorist, or indefinite past. And the letters are *d ō ē*. If an *iota* or *ι* is written under the *ō*, the word is optative, and means "might." If the *iota* is written under the *ē*, the word is subjunctive, and means "may." It may indeed be that St. Paul, having represented his constant practice by the present tense, thinks of his past prayers, and states their object in a corresponding form. This, however, is done in the style

of the Hellenist or Greek-speaking Jew. The Attic Greek would use the optative, "might," after the present tense to suggest a doubt of obtaining an answer. There is no question, however, as to St. Paul's meaning. And the matter is only worth notice as illustrating the speed, at which he is working, his mind moving rapidly from present to past, and from past to future.

There is no real difficulty in the expression, "the God of our Lord, Jesus Christ," though the Arians used it in the fourth century to oppose our Lord's Godhead as substantially and essentially one with that of the Father. Speaking to the Samaritan woman, our Lord, as Incarnate, possessing a human soul and body, could say

John iv. 22. We are worshipping what we know.

On the Cross, He cried

Matt. xxvii. 46. My God, My God.

And after His Resurrection, He said

John xx. 17. I am ascending toward My Father
And your Father,

And My God
And your God.

Indeed, St. Paul has only just said in this encyclical,

Eph. i. 3. Blessed [is] the God and Father
Of our Lord, Jesus Christ.

And the title, "God of our Lord, Jesus Christ," is specially significant in this epistle, in which our Lord appears as the Ideal Man, set over all creation.

Although the phrase, "the God of our Lord, Jesus Christ" is balanced by the phrase, "the Father of glory,"

yet we, slightly modifying a beautiful remark by Darby in his *Synopsis*, iv. 390, may say that the keynote of this prayer is "God," as that of the "Second Prayer" in iii. 14-19, is "Father."

With regard to this title, "the Father of glory," there is some doubt as to whether it means the Source or the Possessor of glory. The phrase, "the God of glory," in *Acts* vii. 2, is taken from *Psalms* xxix. 3, and means "the glorious God." The expression, "the Lord of glory" in *1 Cor.* ii. 8, is connected with the title, "the King of glory," in *Psalms* xxiv. 7, and means "the glorious King" or "Lord." But "of glory" can hardly be equivalent to the adjective "glorious" in the present place, because the phrase "the Father of glory" corresponds to the parallel phrase "the God of our Lord."

As St. Paul is about to ask for his readers, that God

Eph. i. 17c. Might give you a spirit of wisdom and revelation
In full knowledge of Him,

the glory would seem to be that which proceeds from God, the manifestation of His attributes through, and to men, rather than that glory, which is ascribed to Him by men, or possessed by Himself. There are three phrases, which confirm this explanation. When St. Paul describes God as

2 Cor. i. 3. The Father of the mercies,
And God of all encouragement,

it is clear that the mercies proceed from the Father, as the encouragement from God. In *Heb.* xii. 9, God is spoken of as "the Father of the spirits" in contrast with "the fathers of our flesh." And in *St. James* i. 17, He is named "the Father of the lights," as the Creator and Source of the heavenly luminaries, and of the intellectual and spiritual lights, which those material orbs symbolise.

But the phrase, "a spirit of wisdom and revelation in full knowledge of Him," requires some consideration. No doubt, the gift came from God the Father, has been merited by God the Son, and is communicated by God the Holy Spirit. It is not God, the Holy Spirit, the Uncreated Grace, who is given. The title "Holy Spirit," without the article in Greek, implies a gift or manifestation of the Holy Spirit, rather than the Person of the Holy Spirit. For example, the title lacks the article in the Greek of our Lord's words,

Luke xi. 13. How much more the Father, the [Father] out of heaven,
Will give [the] Holy Spirit to those, who petition Him?

In interpreting the phrase, "a spirit of wisdom," we must be careful not to read into the word "spirit" the idea of a mood, temper, or temperament. It implies a Divine elevation of the human spirit to supernatural activity. And since it is given by the Personal Spirit of God to the personal spirit of man, it is spoken of as a spirit.

It is "a spirit of wisdom and revelation." Such a spirit recalls the Isaian prediction as to the Messiah or Christ:

Isaiah xi. 2. And the Spirit of Jehovah will rest upon Him,
The Spirit of wisdom and intelligence,

The Spirit of counsel and might,
The Spirit of knowledge and the fear of Jehovah.

And according to the doctrine of this encyclical, those gifts to Messiah would also be given to His holy [ones], who have their life and movement and being in Him.

Now the total world of caused causes implies a Cause beyond it, and therefore not among the caused causes, but an Uncaused Cause, the First Cause, which realises the idea of Cause fully and perfectly, since It is not an effect. The

statical and dynamical relations of that total world of caused causes indicate the wisdom of a Personal Intellect in that Uncaused Cause. Its biological and psychological elements involve evidence of purpose and a Personal Will. Then, the human consciousness of right and wrong, apart from tribal custom and State enactments, speaks of a Supreme Law, as the human consciousness of good and evil, apart from utility and beauty, hints of a Supreme Ideal or Good. So much at least we can know of God by natural reason. In that process, however, the mind passes from point to point in the exercise of intelligence ; but the exercise of wisdom would lead to some comprehension of God as one object, not so much distinguished by our intelligence from His creatures, as seen and known in Himself.

St. Paul prays for a spirit of wisdom, more than natural, and equal to a supernatural intuition of God ; and he does not wait to define its limits. That there are limits is implied in the further description of that spirit as one of revelation. The Apostle prays that the sanctified souls, to whom he is writing, may receive a spirit of revelation, of apocalypse, for the unveiling of mysteries. Those mysteries, we found in *Eph.* i. 9, are Divine secrets, Divine truths, which are known by Divine communication alone. In the present passage, the Divine mysteries are those of God Himself ; for the spirit of wisdom and revelation is to find its scope and exercise in the full knowledge of Him.

We have rendered the Greek word, *epi-gnōsis*, as “ full knowledge ” to distinguish it from *gnōsis*, “ knowledge.” So St. Paul, contrasting his present state with his future, says,

I Cor. xiii. 12. Now I *know* in part ;
But then I shall *know fully*,
As also I was *known fully*.

But *epi-gnōsis* implies even more than full knowledge. In

the Greek Testament, the word is used fifteen times by St. Paul. Outside of his epistles, it is only found in *Heb.* x. 26, and *2 Pet.* i. 2, 3, 8, ii. 20. And we may cherish a suspicion that both of these epistles owe the word to Pauline influence. Therefore, it is of importance to note in what connections the Apostle uses the term. The object of the knowledge is either God, or God's will, or God's Son, or the truth, or sin. From this, it appears that the word implies religious knowledge and, at the same time, spiritual experience.

This full knowledge, in our present passage, is full knowledge with regard to God. And this indicates St. Paul's perspective. His view was neither anthropocentric, nor geocentric, nor heliocentric, but theocentric; for he found the centre of his universe in God, and not in man, or earth or sun. It is this reach and truth of his outlook, that makes his least word more illuminating than all the speculations of those, who found or find their first principle in the "Know thyself" of the Milesian Thales, first of speculative philosophers, or in the doctrine of the sophist Protagoras, that every individual man is the measure of all things.

i. 18a-c. God's Call.

First of all, then, the Apostle prayed that they might have a full knowledge of God. Now, he prays that they may know what God's calling involves for them. True, the grammar of the opening words has occasioned much difficulty. Those words are all in the accusative or objective case; and there are various explanations of the form. Some argue that it is an absolute accusative, like the regular Greek absolute genitive and the English absolute nominative, and means simply,

Eph. i. 18. The eyes of your heart having been enlightened,

that is,

When the eyes of your heart have been enlightened.

But there is little ground in Greek for assuming the existence of an absolute accusative with a participle. Others suggest that the phrase depends on the verb, "might give" in *Eph.* i. 17. Therefore such interpreters represent the Apostle as asking God to give the readers

The eyes of your heart enlightened.

This would be a clumsy mode of expressing the idea, especially as the enlightenment of the eyes depends on the gift of wisdom and revelation, for which St. Paul had asked. It has also been urged that the words "in full knowledge of Him" should be separated from the last verse, and be added to the verse before us. But in the last verse, they help to form the parallelism, and to complete the sense.

The explanation, however, is really simple, the very simplicity hiding it from so many scholars of eminence. If we look forward, we shall find St. Paul dictating,

Eph. i. 18. Unto the [end] that you may know
What is the hope of His calling,

the word for "you" being in the accusative case with the infinitive verb. St. Paul, then, would say,

Unto the [end] that you—
Enlightened as to the eyes of your heart—
May know
What is the hope of His calling.

But putting the first line into the third, he produces the verse in this fashion,

Eph. i. 18. [You], enlightened as to the eyes of your heart—

Unto the [end] that you may know

What is the hope of His calling—

We need a moment, and only a moment, to justify our substitution of the phrase, "the eyes of your heart" for the current reading, "the eyes of your mind." The Hebrew regarded the heart as the organ of thought, and indeed as representing the personality of the man. So it was possible for a Hebrew to form such a figure of speech as "the eyes of the heart," just as a Greek, such as Plato, in his *Republic*, p. 533 A, or Aristotle, in his *Nicomachean Ethics*, VI., xii. 10, would, on the other hand, speak of reason as "the eye of the soul." It was, then, the strangeness of the Oriental metaphor, which led some cursive or minuscule copyists, after the rise of cursive manuscripts in the ninth century, to remove the word for "heart" in favour of *diánoia*, "mind," the faculty of discursive thought or reasoning. The same change is found in the Thessalian bishop, Œcumenius, who possibly wrote at the end of our sixth century. It also occurs in the printed editions of the Jerusalem Cyril, consecrated in 350, and the Syrian Theodoret, in 423; but it is difficult to believe that the change had been made as early as the time of those writers.

On the other hand, St. Clement of Rome, xxxvi, in the year 95, says that "the eyes of our heart were opened" through our Lord. And the word "heart" is supported by the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, of Cent iv., by the Alexandrian A of Cent v., by the Claromontanus D of Cent. vi., and by the six uncials of the ninth century, the Sangerman E, the Augien F and Boernerian G, the Moscovian K and Angelic L, with the Porphyrrian P. It is supported by the Bohairic version of Northern Egypt, the

Sahidic of Southern Egypt and the Ethiopic; by the Peshîtta or Syriac Vulgate of 411 and the Harclean Syriac of 616, by the Gothic of Ulphilas, made after 341, and the Armenian, made after 431; and by the Old Latin and St. Jerome's Vulgate of 385. It is read by Origen in 231, St. Athanasius in 328, the Syrian Ephraem, iii. 333, in 373, St. Chrysostom before 398, the Alexandrian Cyril, on St. John, p. 838, in 412, the Alexandrian Euthalius in 458 and the Damascene in 717. And it is presented in the cursives, 17 of Cent. ix. or x., 47 of Cent. xi., and 37 of Cent. xv.

In restoring the word "heart" we restore the fuller meaning. For the Hebrew implies more by "heart" than the Greek by *diánoia*, "the faculty of reasoning," the former including the will and designs, the whole reasonable man. It is, therefore, spiritual experience, rather than merely intellectual knowledge, that is in question. And the enlightenment of such spiritual vision is only by the supernatural sunlight from God Himself.

How truly Hebraic is our present passage becomes the more evident, when we compare it with *Fourth Esdras*, xiv. 25, written under Domitian about the year 95, that is, at the same time as St. John's *Apocalypse*. The writer was more probably a Palestinian than an Alexandrian Jew. And we must hold with Sanday, in his "Prefatory Note" to Box's *Ezra-Apocalypse*, p. 9,* that the coincidences between the writer and St. Paul must be traceable ultimately to the School of Gamaliel. There is certainly not sufficient resemblance between the Pauline "fulness of the seasons," *Eph.* i. 10, and the fulfilment of the measure of the times, *Esdr.* iv. 37, or between the Pauline "mystery," *Eph.* i. 9, and the "secret of the Most High," known only to Ezra, *Esdr.* xii. 36, or between the Pauline "you were sealed," *Eph.* i. 13, iv. 30, and the sealing of those, who had formed

a treasure of faith, *Esdr.* vi. 5, or between the Pauline distinguishing of this age from the future one, *Eph.* i. 21, and the mention of Esau as the end of this world and of Jacob as the beginning of that to follow, *Esdr.* vi. 9, to substantiate any direct connection. But for that reason, there is more value in the answer, which God is represented as making to Ezra's request for the Holy Spirit to write.

4 *Esdr.* xiv. 25. And I will kindle in thy heart
A lamp of comprehension,

Which will not be extinguished
Until what things thou wilt begin to write, are
being finished.

In our present passage, *Eph.* i. 18, also, that which is to know is the heart, in the full Hebraic sense of that term. That which is to be known is the hope, involved in God's calling us. In the previous verse, *Eph.* i. 17, God Himself was the object of the supernatural knowledge. And as objects of knowledge, God and the hope of His calling differ. In the former case, the direct object is God: in the latter, not the hope itself, but what we know about it. James, in his *Principles of Psychology*, i. 221, distinguishes the two kinds of knowledge as "knowledge of acquaintance" and "knowledge about." The former implies the presence of the object, an acquaintance with it by experience. The latter implies the idea of the object and our thinking about it. As he adds, most languages express the distinction, for example, Latin in *noscere* and *scire*, German in *kennen* and *wissen*, French in *connaître* and *savoir*, and Greek in *gnônai* and *eidénai*. Now, we have just found that St. Paul uses *epi-gnōsis*, "full knowledge," from *gnônai*, "to know," in regard to our spiritual experience of God. But in the present place, speaking of the hope in God's calling, he uses *eidénai*, for "to know," because he is praying that his

readers may know about it. And the particular knowledge in its regard, that he prays for, is what it is, its essence, the notes which constitute it what it is, the sum of its essential attributes.

Now a statement of an object's essential characteristics is a definition of that object; and that which St. Paul would have his readers able to define is the hope of God's calling. It is, therefore, not our own feeling of hope, or our own view of the hope, that is in question, but what that hope in itself really and truly involves. In the *Epistle to the Colossians*, i. 5, St. Paul had just spoken of it as "the hope, the [hope] laid away for you in the heavens," so that it is a supernatural object, to be awaited truly and known essentially by supernatural grace alone.

The hope is that involved in God's calling. In the epistle which St. Paul will a few months hence, and in this same prison, write to the *Philippians* iii. 14, he will speak of God's call as "the upward calling of God." In *Heb.* iii. 1, it is described as "a heavenly calling." And five years hence, in the summer of 66 A.D., writing again from Rome, but in his second and sterner imprisonment, he will write of it as a holy calling, *2 Tim.* i. 9. It is the Apostle's use of the term *klēsis*, "calling," which must determine its meaning, for it is not found in the Greek Testament outside his epistles, except in *Heb.* iii. 1, and *2 Pet.* i. 10, both of which seem to show traces of his influence. It has been said by Westcott, commenting on the present verse, *Eph.* i. 18, that the call in *1 Cor.* vii. 17, appears to be to the outward society alone. There each person is directed to walk or live in the state, married or uncircumcised, or whatever the case may be, in which God has called him. But surely, there is nothing in such a direction to limit the call to the outward society, especially as the call to the outward society would naturally imply a call to sanctification.

Then we must conclude from St. Paul's language, that God's calling is not merely God's calling from heaven, but God's calling to heaven. And our co-operation with His grace is not in question at this moment.

Eph. i. 18d, e. God's Possession.

St. Paul has just prayed that his readers may be given supernatural light to define the hope of God's calling, and know its essential nature. Now he passes to another object for their knowledge. It is important to note that he does so without a conjunction. Therefore, what appears to be quite a new object really explains the preceding one. It is true that some, not understanding this relation between the two passages, prefixed "and" to the second. But we can show in our next section, that the word is not in the true text.

Now we note the Apostle's plea for his readers that they may know

**Eph. i. 18d. What the wealth of the glory
Of His possession in the holy [ones].**

We have already heard St. Paul speak of God the Holy Spirit as part-payment at present, and therefore the future possession of the saints, *Eph. i. 13*. There, the Apostle represented God as the saints' future possession. Here, he represents the saints as God's future possession. So they are approved as the true Israel, and take the position, which St. Paul indicated in *Eph. i. 11*, and Moses stated in

**Deut. xxxii. 9. For the lot of Jehovah is His People :
Jacob is the portion of His possession.**

But it is the wealth of the glory, to be manifested in that possession, which St. Paul would have them know. "The

wealth of the glory" is a Pauline phrase. The Apostle employs it on three other occasions. And we may ascertain its meaning by considering the passages. First of all, in January, 57, he writes from Corinth to the Romans, saying,

Rom. ix. 22. And if God, willing to shew the wrath
And to make known His power, bore

(With much longanimity)

Vessels [deserving] of wrath,
Fully-adjusted unto destruction ;

23. And in order that He might make known
The wealth of His glory

Upon vessels of mercy,
Which He prepared unto glory—

The sentence is cut short, and must be completed by some such parallels as

[He chose some,
That He might call them to faith].

We may, for the moment, omit the parenthesis,

(With much longanimity),

longanimity being such patience and self-restraint under trial, as magnanimity is after trial and victory. Then we see that the couplet,

Upon vessels of mercy
Which He prepared unto glory.

corresponds to the couplet,

Vessels of wrath,
Fully-adjusted unto destruction.

Further, we note that the couplet,

And in order that He might make known
The wealth of His glory,

answers to the couplet,

And if God, willing to shew the wrath
And to make known His power, bore.

In the one case, He would make known His power, and in the other, the wealth of His glory. From this passage then, we take the contrast between God's wealth of glory and the greatness of His power.

But now, in 61, St. Paul has only just written to the Colossians, speaking of the Mystery, the [Mystery] which had been hidden away by God from the ages and from the generations, but is now manifested to His holy [ones],

Col. i. 27. To whom God willed to make known
What the wealth of the glory

Of this mystery—
In the nations—

Who is Christ in you—
The hope of the glory.

So we find the expression, "What the wealth of the glory," in both *Col.* i. 27, and *Eph.* i. 18d. In the former case, it is defined by the presence of Christ, as the hope of the glory, in the Church. And this Mystery is to be made known among the nations. In the latter case, it is found in the saints, as they form God's possession. From this passage then, we take the explanation of the phrase by the presence of Christ; and at the same time, we note its connection with "the hope of the glory."

Again, we listen to St. Paul, as he dictates his encyclical.

In a few minutes, he will reach the passage, which Stephen Langton in 1205 will include in the third chapter, and Robert Estienne in 1551 will distinguish as verses sixteen and seventeen. Then St. Paul, in his second prayer, will repeat this phrase, "the wealth of His glory," from his first, praying God,

Eph. iii. 16. In order that He may give you—
According to the wealth of His glory—

To be made mighty with power
By means of His Spirit
[Sent] into the inward man—

17. The Christ to dwell
By means of faith
In your hearts in love.

If we compare the two triplets, we see how the lines are balanced, "your hearts" with "the inward man," "by means of faith" with "by means of His Spirit," and the Christ's indwelling with the becoming mighty. So "the wealth of His glory" should be understood with reference to the work of the Holy Spirit and the dwelling of the Christ in the members of His Church.

If we now sum up what we have gained, we find "the wealth of His glory" connected with the presence of the Christ and the Holy Spirit, and with the hope of the glory. At the same time, it is distinguished from God's power. If we return to our verse, we see that its theme also is connected with the saints' hope, and distinguished from God's power. Indeed, these words,

Eph. i. 18d. What the wealth of the glory
Of His possession in the saints,

are added as an explanation of the preceding lines,

Eph. i. 18a. —[You] enlightened as to the eyes of your heart—
 Unto the [end] that you may know
 What is the hope of His calling—

Further, the next question will have reference to the power of God. There are therefore two questions, one with regard to the future of the saints, and the other with respect to God's power. The latter will be illustrated by the exaltation of the Christ, *Eph.* i. 19-23. Afterwards, in *Eph.* ii. 1-7, both the future of the saints and the power of God will be brought together to explain the redemption of the Christ's people, of whom it is true that they are in the Christ and that the Christ is in them.

1. 18d. A Disputed Reading, " and."

There are then two questions, and not three, as many suppose, who distinguish the hope of God's calling from the wealth of the glory, and both from the greatness of the power. Unfortunately, the common Greek text suggests three questions by inserting " and " before the line,

Eph. i. 18d. What the wealth of the glory—

The word falls under suspicion at once as a Syrian reading. We note it has the support of St. Chrysostom, before 398; of the Syrian Theodoret, who was consecrated about 423, and depended much on St. Chrysostom; of the Damascene who flourished about 717, and epitomised St. Chrysostom's commentaries on St. Paul; of the Syrian uncials, the Moscovian K and the Angelic L; and of the cursives, 47, of Cent. xi., and 37, of Cent. xv.

Of the other witnesses in favour of the word, we may at once reject the Sangerman E, made in the ninth century from the Claromontanus D, the latter uncial having already suffered from its second corrector in that same century.

So E and D^c represent one witness ; and he is of the ninth century.

Now we may take the Latin group to see what is its decision as a whole. The Old Latin, represented by the Latin versions in Claromontanus d of the ninth century, its copy in the Sangerman e of the ninth, and the twin copies, the Augien f and Boernerian g, both of the ninth, is against the word. This is confirmed first of all by Victorinus, who taught rhetoric in Rome, and was converted there before 361, so we may take his commentary on this *Epistle to the Ephesians* as presenting the Old Latin at Rome in 360. Then a second confirmation comes in the Gothic version which was indeed made by Ulphilas, the "Little Wolf," after his consecration at Constantinople in 341, but was affected by the Old Latin on entering Italy in the Lombards' invasion of 568. Again, it is confirmed in 385 by the Latin Vulgate of St. Paul's epistles. For the word is omitted in the Fuldensis of 540, the Amiatinus of 716 and the Toletanus of Cent. viii ; though it was afterwards inserted in the Demidovianus of Cent. xii. or xiii. and the Clementine Vulgate of 1592. Against such evidence it would be futile to quote Ambrosiaster. This writer may have been the Roman Faustinus. He is known as Ambrosiaster, because his works were printed under St. Ambrose's name, though St. Augustine, in his treatise of 427 A.D., *against Two Letters of Pelagius*, iv. 7, speaks of him as St. Hilary. In any case, his comment on 1 Tim. iii. 15, shows him to have lived under Pope Dámasus, that is, between 366 and 384. So we may regard him as a Roman contemporary of St. Jerome. Now St. Jerome, like Ambrosiaster, inserts the word "and" in his commentary, written under Origen's influence in 388. But his own Vulgate and the Old Latin determine the omission of the word from the Latin tradition as to the text.

St. Jerome evidently derived the word from Origen, in whom it appears, according to the quotations in Cramer's *Caténæ*, vi. pp. 131, 161, of 1842. This raises the question of the Alexandrian and Caesarean tradition, Origen having passed from Alexandria to Caesarea in 231. He is apparently followed by the Alexandrian Cyril in his commentary on *St. John*, p. 838, between 417 and 428. And the Bohairic version, made for Northern Egypt about 200 or 250, supports him. But the Alexandrian and Caesarean testimonies against the word outweigh those in favour; for it is omitted in the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, uncials of 331, the Alexandrian A of Cent. v., and the Claromontanus D of Cent. vi., apparently made in Egypt. To these we may add the Alexandrian deacon, Euthalius, who edited St. Paul's epistles in 458, and the cursive 17, of Cent. ix. or x., and Alexandrian form.

There are some other witnesses on each side. The word is found in the Syrian Ephraem, iii. 333, about 373, in the Peshîtta, or Syriac Vulgate of 411, in the Armenian after 431, in the Ethiopic about 600, in the Harclean Syriac of 616, in the second corrector of the Sinaitic Aleph, of Cent. vii., in the second corrector of the Claromontanus D, and in the Porphyrian P, both of Cent ix. It is omitted in the twin uncials, the Augien F and the Boernerian G, both of the ninth century, and in the cursive 59, of Cent. x. or xi.

As the balance of the Alexandrian and of the Latin witnesses is against the reading, the support of the Syrian becomes still more suspicious; and in the result, we are obliged to reject the word as "Syrian."

This conclusion is confirmed by the consideration that a copyist or commentator would be more likely to insert than to omit the word, as its absence seems to place the second couplet in an abrupt juxtaposition to the first.

Eph. i, 19, 20. God's Power.

As St. Paul has prayed that his readers may know what glory will be found in the saints, he now prays that they may know what power will be found in God. In truth, these are one; for it is not an abstract question of God's power, but the concrete fact of God's power in regard to His saints. And as we read the Apostle's words, we may note the various words he employs to express the active power of God. He asks that they may know

Eph. i. 19. And what the exceeding greatness
Of His power unto us—who believe—

According to the activity of the might of
His strength,
20. [With] which He was active in the Christ,

When He raised Him from among dead [men],
And when He seated Him in His right-hand
[place] in the heavenlies.

The words, "who believe," must be taken as a parenthetical definition of "us." They cannot be taken with the words that follow, for our faith, unhappily, is not to be measured by the activity of the might, which proceeds from God's strength. Indeed, a parallel passage in the *Epistle to the Colossians*, shews us that the Apostle is not dealing with the source or measure of faith, but with the activity or power of God as regarded by faith. For there, he tells his readers of the time,

Col. ii. 12. When you were buried with Him in the baptism,
In which you were also raised with Him,

By means of the faith of the activity of God,
Who raised Him from among dead [men].

“The faith of the activity of God” surely means the faith in the activity of God. For the baptismal faith is a faith in the Resurrection of our Lord, that is, in the activity of God, who raised Him from the dead. And as we listen to St. Paul, we may note how prominent in his mind is that Resurrection, which will in time to come show God’s activity,

Eph. i. 19. And what the exceeding greatness
Of His power to us—who believe—

in our present sanctification and future glorification. That power, we further learn, is measured

According to the activity of the might of His strength,
which was put forth in the Resurrection of our Lord.

There are four words to be distinguished, “power,” “activity,” “might” and “strength.” “Power,” the Greek *dināmis*, regards the source, and implies the manifestation of a potency, inherent in God. “Activity,” the Greek *energeia*, or “energy,” looks at the process, the exercise of power, and sees the power in working. “Might,” the Greek *krátos*, used of Divine might in the Greek Testament, except in *Heb.* ii. 14, suggests mastery and victory, and therefore a resistance. “Strength,” the Greek *ischús*, refers simply and absolutely to inherent power.

Then we should note the phrase, “the exceeding greatness.” The word for “greatness,” *megethos*, connected with *megas*, “great,” is not found in any other passage of the Greek Testament. The word for “exceeding,” *hyperbállon*, in this, its present participle form, is found in *2 Cor.* iii. 10, ix. 14, *Eph.* i. 19, ii. 7, iii. 19, as the noun, *hyperbolē*, “excess,” in *Rom.* vii. 13, *1 Cor.* xii. 31, *2 Cor.* i. 8, iv. 7, 17, xii. 7, *Gal.* i. 13, and the adverb in *2 Cor.* xi. 23. As these are the only occurrences of the forms in the

Greek Testament, it would appear that the figure is almost as characteristic of St. Paul's epistles, as "the Holy One" of *Isaiah*, "immediately" of St. Mark's Petrine Gospel, and the verb "to begin" of St. Luke's writings.

God's innate and inherent strength was put forth as might to overcome the resistance of death. This might passed into activity, when He raised the Christ, and foreshewed in that act how great would be the manifestation of His power in our resurrection from sin.

To illustrate the activity of the might of God's strength, St. Paul proceeds to speak of that activity,

Eph. i. 20. [With] which He was active in the Christ,

When He raised Him from among dead [men],
And when He seated Him in His right-hand [place]
in the heavenlies.

The relative, "which," as feminine in Greek, must refer to the "strength" or to the "activity." But the verb, "He was active," shews that it refers to the activity. If we had translated the noun by "working" instead of "activity," we should now render the relative clause as

Which He wrought in the Christ.

The line, however, dwells rather on the activity itself than on what was wrought by the activity.

It may be necessary to defend the word, rendered "He was active." There is some evidence for another verbal form, to be rendered, "He has been active." The difference in meaning is slight, but the perfect tense, "He has been active," implies a continuance of the effect, while the aorist or indefinite past tense, "He was active," suggests a momentary and distinct act. The difference in the words

also is small. The perfect is *enērgēken*, the aorist differing in having *s* instead of *k*. One might easily be substituted for the other. The aorists, which follow in "raised" and "seated" might lead a reader to substitute an aorist for the perfect, *s* for *k*. Again a defect of eye or ear might lead a copyist to substitute a perfect for the aorist, *k* for *s*.

The *k*, however, is only found in the small district, formed by Palestine and the Delta. There it occurs in the Vatican B of Caesarea and the year 331; then about a century later in the Alexandrian Cyril's commentary on *St. John*, p. 838, and in the contemporary Alexandrian uncial A; later still, in Euthalius' edition of St. Paul's epistles in 458, according to a manuscript of 1301; and finally, in a note on *Isaiah* ix. 7, among some comments, collected by Procopius of Gaza in 520.

But even within that district, that evidence is outweighed by contrary evidence. For *s* is found in the Sinaitic Aleph, made at the same time, and in the same library as the Vatican B. The Alexandrian Cyril, who witnessed once for *k*, witnesses twice for *s*, once in his *Defence of the Twelve Chapters*, vi. 174, and again, in 430, in his tract on *the Right Faith*, p. 70. Then according to Cramer's *Caténæ*, vi. p. 131, of 1842, we have Origen, who left Alexandria for Caesarea in 231. We have also Eusebius of Caesarea, in his commentary on *Isaiah*, p. 391a, written before 340, and the Jerusalem Cyril, p. 220, about 346. To these we must add the Claromontanus D, probably made in Egypt in the sixth century, and the cursive 17, of Cent. ix. or x., with its Alexandrian text.

So within that district, *s* prevails. Outside, there is none to dispute its right. We find it not only in the Syrian text of the two uncials, the Moscovian K and the Angelic L, both of Cent. ix., but also in the same text, as

represented by St. Chrysostom, before 398, and his imitators, the Syrian Theodoret, about 423, and the Damascene, about 717. With these, we may class the cursives, 47, of Cent. xi., and 37, of Cent. xv.

We found *s* in the Western Text of Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi. Naturally, it reappears in Sangerman E, a ninth century copy of that uncial. The Western Text again witnesses for it in the twin uncials, the Augien F and Boernerian G, of Cent. ix. And it is quite possible that Ephraem of Edessa, iii, 333, about 373, reproduces the Old Syriac in its favour.

The Porphyrian P, of Cent. ix., also has *s*, which is supported, as we have seen, by the three texts, Alexandrian, Western and Syriac.

Therefore we read, "He was active." And we gather that St. Paul would shew his readers what power is active on their behalf. This he does by pointing to the first Easter morning and the first movement of life in the Sacred Body, from which indeed the Divine Word had never departed. It is true that our Lord attributed His own Resurrection to Himself, for of His own Life, He said,

John x. 18. I have authority to lay it down ;
And I have authority to take it again.

But so saying, He attributed it to the Father also, as indeed the next sentence makes explicit :

I received this commandment from My Father.

The Resurrection, however, was an act, external to the Eternal and Essential Life of the Ever-Blessed Trinity. It was therefore an act of the One God. But such an act may be appropriated, as we say, to one Person, power

being attributed to the Father, wisdom to the Son, and goodness to the Holy Spirit. So the Resurrection of our Blessed Lord involved the power of the Father, the Divine Nature of the Son, and the activity of the Holy Spirit as the Giver of Life.

But St. Paul is at present illustrating the Father's power ; and therefore, he continues, telling his readers how the Eternal Father seated the Raised Christ at His own right hand in the heavenlies. His right hand is plainly enough a figure of speech for the highest place in the Universe. It is doubtless due originally to

Ps. cx. 1. [It is] declared of [that is, by] Jehovah to my Lord,
" Sit at My right,
" Until I shall put Thy foes
" [As] a footstool for Thy feet."

But some comments on this passage have shewn that there is a danger of treating the heavenlies also as merely figurative. The very fact that our Blessed Lord possesses His Sacred Body, implies that He is not only omnipresent as God, but also locally present as Man.

It does not follow that the heavenly order stands in spatial relation to the visible order. When our Lord shewed Himself to His disciples on the evening of His Resurrection, *John* xx. 19, He did not need to pass through the closed doors. When a cloud received Him from their sight forty days later, *Acts* i. 9, He did not pass beyond the stars. He passed into an invisible order. But when we use such an expression, it is necessary to distinguish between the physical, the psychical, the preternatural and the supernatural.

Now physicists willingly allow that the visible order depends on an invisible one, for they, as Preston writes in his *Theory of Light*, second edition, p. 28, tend " to regard

all the phenomena of Nature, and even matter itself, as manifestations of energy stored in the ether." No doubt, whenever men attain an analysis of the ether, there will remain the question as to the source of the energy as well as of this dense, invisible substance, which has been excogitated in a new form to solve the problems of light, electricity and radio-activity.

Meta-physicists, or meta-physicians, and psychologists, recognise another "Unseen Universe," besides that of the invisible ether. It is the world of souls. But greater still is the preternatural world of God's angels; and supremely great is God's own supernatural order. Points of correlation, to use a figure of speech, arise between the supernatural and preternatural orders and the psychical and physical orders, such apparitions as that at Lourdes, and such symbols as that of a door opened in heaven, *Apoc.* iv. 1, representing such points of correlation. And the Return of our Blessed Lord, as Stokes points out in his commentary on the *Acts of the Apostles*, vol. 1. p. 46, is never described as a descent from some distant region, but as an apocalypse, the removal of a veil from an unseen chamber.

This verse, *Eph.* i. 20, as we have seen, illustrates the Father's power; and therefore, it speaks of the Father as having raised the Christ, and seated Him in the heavenlies. We have rendered the two Greek participles in aorist or indefinite past time as "when He raised" and "when He seated Him." In forty-six passages, the latter verb is intransitive, meaning "to sit down." But its simple form in *1 Cor.* vi. 4, and its compound form in *Eph.* ii. 6, are transitive, meaning "to seat." And in the present passage also, it must signify "to seat," as the whole passage, *Eph.* i. 20-22, describes the activity of God in regard to the Messiah or Christ.

i. 20c. A Disputed Reading: "when He seated Him."

We rendered the aorist, or indefinite past, participle, *kathisas* as "when He seated," and we read the word "Him" in our Greek text. Some witnesses read the aorist, or indefinite past, indicative, *ekáthisen*, "He seated"; and some omit the Greek word for "Him." The question, then, is whether we ought to read

When He seated Him,
or
When He seated [Him],
or
He seated Him,
or
He seated [Him].

Such a question has no slight value in helping us to determine the reliability of the witnesses to the text. There are four alternatives, for there is the variation between the participle, rendered "when He seated," and the finite form, rendered "He seated." There is also the choice between reading "Him" in the Greek, or merely supplying it as "[Him]" in the English translation.

We have adopted the reading, "When He seated Him," and to the suggestion that a scribe would readily supply "Him" in the Greek text itself, we answer that in the present case, the scribe, who understood the verb as "He sat down," would naturally omit the word, "Him." As to the rival form, "He seated," we suggest that it may have been derived from *Heb.* i. 3, where we read, "He sat down on the right hand."

In favour of the form which we have chosen,

When He seated Him,

Alexandria witnesses through the Alexandrian A of Cent. v.,

and the Alexandrian deacon, Euthalius, in 458. Caesarea speaks through the Sinaitic Aleph of 331, and through Eusebius, its bishop before 315, in his *Demonstration*, p. 224, and his commentary on *Isaiah*, p. 391. Gaza supports them through Procopius, who collected some ancient comments on *Isaiah* about 520. The West also adduces representative testimony, for the reading is found at Milan in St. Ambrose's treatise on *Faith*, begun in 377 and finished in 379. At the same time, it appears in Victorinus at Rome, where that teacher of rhetoric had been converted about 360. It occurs in St. Jerome, who left Rome in 385, and wrote his commentary on the *Epistle to the Ephesians* in 388. And crossing to Africa, we find the words in Tertulian of Carthage, who became a Montanist in 199.

We are supported as to the participle by several cursives; 10 is of unknown date, but 59 is of Cent. x. or xi., 31, 47, 73, of Cent. xi., 116 of Cent. xiii., and 213 of Cent. xiv. And though the pronoun "Him" is omitted by the Vatican B of 331, the Jerusalem Cyril, p. 220, of 346, the Latin Vulgate of 385, and the Alexandrian Cyril, in his commentary in *St. John*, p. 838, about 412, yet these witnesses also support the participle, and prove it to be the most probable reading.

We are supported as to the pronoun "Him," by Origen of 231, according to Cramer's *Caténæ* of 1842, on the *Ephesians*, p. 133, as well as by the Bohairic version of Northern Egypt in 200 or 250, and the Ethiopic of 600, though these read the finite form of the verb. And we note that the pronoun is found in the Peshîtta Syriac of 411, and the Harclean Syriac of 616. So, taking all our witnesses together, we accept the pronoun as the most probable reading.

The opposite reading,

He seated [Him],

reads the finite verb and omits the pronoun. Its support is Syrian and Western. The Syrian evidence includes St. Chrysostom, before 398, and of course with him the Syrian Theodoret, about 423, and the Damascene about 717. It also embraces the two Syrian uncials, both of the ninth century, the Moscovian K and the Angelic L. To these we add the Porphyrian P, also of the ninth century.

The Western witnesses are the Claromontanus D of Cent. vi., its ninth century copy, the Sangerman E., the twin Uncials, the Augien F and Boernerian G, of the same ninth century, St. Hilary of Poitiers, about 354, his Roman contemporary, Ambrosiaster, who wrote under St. Jerome's friend, Pope Dámasus, 366-384, and the Old Latin, so far as it is represented by the Latin versions in Claromontanus d, Sangerman e, and Boernerian g. To these we add the Armenian and the Gothic, for the reading in the former may represent the Old Syriac ; and that in the latter, the Old Latin.

Eph. i. 21, 22a. The Christ and the Universe.

The remaining verses of the chapter, *Eph.* i. 21-23, form a magnificent doxology, full of the deepest significance and the loftiest feeling. Here the exaltation and supremacy of the Divine Messiah or Christ is proclaimed, first, in regard to the Universe, *Eph.* i. 21, 22a ; and then, in regard to the Church, *Eph.* i. 22c, 23.

Now the Christ is seated

**Eph. i. 21. Over-above every principdom and authority
And power and lordship,**

**And every name
[That is] being named,**

Not only in this age,
But also in the future one.

22a. And He subordinated all things
Under His-feet.

The word, *hyper-ánō*, "over-above," does not imply a distance between our Lord and these classes of beings, because the Cherubim, which were on the ark, were said to be "over-above" it. The expression is simply one of those compounds, such as *hupo-kátō* "under-neath," *Mk.* vi. 11, which became somewhat frequent in later Greek. In the Greek Testament, it is only found in *Eph.* i. 21, iv. 10, and *Heb.* ix. 5. In Philo, it is indeed met in a passage, strangely similar to the present one. The author, an Alexandrian Jew, was an old man, when he sailed for Rome more than twenty-two years ago, in the winter at the beginning of 39 A.D., to lead an embassy to Caligula. He wrote in his treatise *on the Doctrine that Dreams are sent from God*, I. xxv., of Jacob's ladder, in *Genesis* xxviii. 12. "But the dream disclosed the archangel Jehovah established on the ladder. For it must be supposed the Being [neuter gender, *to on*] stands *over-above*, as a driver of a chariot, or as helmsman of a ship, over bodies, over souls, over all creatures, over earth, over air, over heaven, over powers, perceived by the senses, over unseen natures, whatsoever things are seen or unseen. For having fastened the world, all of it, and attached it to Himself, He drives vast Nature."

St. Paul, in his enumeration of principedoms, authorities, powers and lordships, certainly implies ranks and classes in the spiritual world. In *Eph.* iii. 10, he will tell how the principedoms and the authorities in the heavenlies learn

. by means of the Church
The multifarious wisdom of God.

In *Eph.* vi. 12, he will distinguish various classes among evil spirits, and will name them princedoms, authorities and rulers of the world. He has already in *Col.* i. 16, spoken of thrones, lordships, princedoms and authorities. And in writing to the Thessalonians in May, 52, he mentioned an archangel, 1 *Thess.* iv. 16. So we find princedoms, authorities, powers, lordships, thrones and archangels explicitly in St. Paul.

Two of these, the thrones and the authorities, had been named among the seven ranks, recognised by the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, "Levi," 3, a work written in Hebrew under John Hyrcanus between 135 and 105 B.C., and much interpolated by Christians between 100 A.D. and 400 A.D. In a passage of *Enoch* lxi. 10, written in the last years of Jannaeus, who reigned from 105 to 78 B.C., we meet Cherubim, Seraphim and the Ophanim, that is, God's chariot-wheels of *Ezek.* i. 15, 16, as well as all the angels of power and all the angels of princedoms.

From St. Paul, and confessing himself ignorant of the Apostle's more original sources, Origen, about 231, derived five ascending classes, angels, princedoms, authorities, thrones and lordships. The number is doubled by the Syrian Ephraem of Edessa, *Syriac Works*, i. 270, about 370 A.D. He treated angels as a special rank, and borrowed gods, cherubim, and seraphim from the Old Testament. Before 398, St. Chrysostom said the names are "obscure and not made known." And St. Augustine declined to discuss the angelic titles, as he did not know their full meaning. "Let them say," said he, "who can; if, however, they can prove what they say. I confess myself ignorant of those things," *Enchiridion*, c. lviii., written apparently in 421, after St. Jerome's death in 420, c. lxxxvii.

A volume on the *Celestial Hierarchy*, which was written

about 500 A.D., and published as the work of Dionysius, the Areopagite and friend of St. Paul, *Acts* xvii. 34, presented the angelic orders in the form, which became current in the Middle Ages. St. Thomas Aquinas, who died on March 7, 1274, has bequeathed us the theological expression of the Middle Ages in his *Summa Theologica*. There, in Part I., Question cviii., Article 5, following the 34th of the homilies, delivered by St. Gregory the Great on the Gospels, while he was Pope, 590-604 A.D., he names nine orders, and derives their names, the "Seraphim" from *Isaiah* vi., the "Cherubim" from *Ezekiel* x., the "Thrones" from *Col.* i., the "Dominations," "Virtues," "Powers" and "Princedom" from *Eph.* i., the "Archangels" from *Jude*, and the "Angels" from many places of Scripture. Dante, who dated his *Comedy* in the year 1300, has bequeathed us the poetical expression of the Middle Ages in that poem. There, in the *Paradiso*, Canto xxviii., and his vision of the ninth heaven, he describes nine orders of angels, and appeals to "Dionysius" for their names and relative positions, which he gives as Seraphim, Cherubim, Thrones, Dominations, Virtues, Powers, Princedom, Archangels and Angels. And it was no doubt in dependence on Dante, that Spenser, in his *Faerie Queene*, I. xxxix., published in 1589, spoke of the celestial orders as

Singing before th' eternal majesty
In their trinal triplicities on high.

The highest trine consisted of Seraphim, Cherubim and Thrones. The second was formed by Dominations or Lordships, Virtues or the older "Powers," and Powers, or the older "Authorities." And the third included Principalities or Princedom, Archangels and Angels.

St. Paul certainly implies that the intelligences, of which

he speaks, are real. And to complete the range of his outlook over Messiah's dominion, he adds,

Eph. i. 21c. And every name
[That is] being named,

Not only in this age,
But also in the future one.

So in Rom. viii. 39, he concludes his list of things, that are unable to separate us from the love of God, by the sweeping expression,

Nor any other creature.

Indeed, that passage, written in the January of 57, more than four years ago, is related to the present one, for there too we read of angels and principedoms, of things present and things future, and of powers.

Lightfoot explains "every name" of "every dignity," as we must do in the epistle of the Roman Clement, xliii., xlv., written in 95 A.D., and in the Oxyrhynchus papyrus of Grenfell and Hunt, i. 58, written in 288 A.D. But Abbott strongly denies the idea of dignity to the word "name," on the ground of constant usage, and because of its present connection with the participle, "being named." Certainly, Abbott's argument deserves attention; and it is abundantly supported by the use of the word "name" to represent "person" in Hebrew, as for example in *Num.* i. 2, 18, and in the New Testament, as for example in *Acts* i. 15, *Apoc.* iii. 4, xi. 13, as well as in the Fayyûm papyri, no. 265₁₈ of 148 A.D., no. 531, ii. 9, of the second century A.D., and elsewhere. And as the plural in such cases represents persons, it may well in the present case stand for personal beings. The matter is not of vital importance. The Apostle's meaning is quite clear, and will be expressed

again, later in the year, when he will say of our Lord's voluntary humiliation,

Phil. ii. 9. On account of which God also super-exalted Him,
And freely-gave Him the Name,
The [Name] over every Name.

The distinction between this age and the future one was familiar to every Jew in our first century. *Tobit* xiv. 5, ought not to be quoted in this connection, it is true; and neither the *Book of Jubilees*, written by a Pharisee in Palestine a little after 6 A.D., nor the small pamphlet, entitled the *Assumption of Moses*, written at the same time as *Jubilees*, and probably its lost conclusion, illustrates the matter. The *Book of Enoch* in xlvi. 7, speaks of "this unjust age," and in lxxi. 15, of "the age to come," both passages belonging to the "Book of the Parables" and the last days of Jannæus, 95-78 B.C. Then, according to the *Ethics of the Fathers*, ii. 8, Hillel, who died about 10 A.D., said that he who gained for himself the words of the Torah, that is, of the Law, gained for himself the life of the age, the coming age, that is, the age to come. During our Lord's life on earth, a Hellenist Jew and fellow-citizen of the Alexandrian Philo, wrote the *Secrets of Enoch*, in which he speaks of the judgement in "the world to come," lviii. 4, and of the many mansions, good and evil, prepared for men in "the world to come," lxi. 2.

It is hardly necessary to note the various passages of the Gospels, for example, *Matt.* xii. 32, *Mk.* x. 30., *Luke* xviii. 30, xx. 34, in which this age is contrasted with that to come. About 70 A.D., when Jerusalem fell, Yokhanan ben Zakkai, or John, the son of Zacchæus, distinguished this age, revealed to Abraham, from "the age to come," not so revealed. And the contemporary *Apocalypse of Baruch* speaks of "the age, that is promised" and "the age to

come," xlii. 13, 15. *Fourth Esdras*, written about the year 95 A.D., when St. John's *Apocalypse* and the Roman Clement's epistle were composed, says that the Most High did not make one age but two. And it asserts a distinction between this age, made for many, and the future age, made for few, viii. 1.

These facts make it at first a little surprising that St. Paul and St. John, who speak of this age and this world, do not make as much use of the terms, "the future age," "the age to come." For these expressions, St. John prefers the phrase, "the eternal life." St. Paul indeed speaks of the period frequently, but he uses the words, "the kingdom of God." This expression corresponds to a Hebrew form for "the kingship of God," which is perhaps best explained, as in *Dan. iv. 25, 26*, by the ruling of the heavens, and by the rule of the Most High in the kingship of man. But twice, and on both occasions in this *Epistle to the Ephesians*, St. Paul adopts the other form of speech, speaking here, *Eph. i. 21*, of the future age, and in *Eph. ii. 7*, of "the ages coming upon [us]," to indicate that period, which is formed, or at least begun by the "days of the Messiah."

Having proclaimed the universal sovereignty of our Lord, the Messiah, or the Christ, in all time and all creation, St. Paul adds an Old Testament prediction to crown the announcement. Naturally, he chooses that verse, which has underlain so much of his argument, and had foretold the exaltation of the Ideal Man, the true Adam, to the Headship of all creation. He, therefore, takes *Psalms viii. 6*, of which the Hebrew literally means,

Thou didst put everything under His feet.

This, St. Paul renders as,

He subordinated all things under His feet.

So he approaches nearer the Greek Vulgate, which runs,

Thou didst subordinate all things underneath His feet,
and is accurately quoted in *Heb.* ii. 8, where it is explained,

For in the [fact that He] subordinated all things to Him,
He dismissed nothing, unsubordinated to Him.

True, it is added,

But now, we do not yet see
All the things subordinated to Him.

But then, that ideal will only be realised in the future age,
when Messiah shall reign,

Until what [time], He has put all the enemies under His feet ;
and

Whenever He has made idle all rule
And all authority and power,

except His,

Who did subordinate all the things to Him.

But whenever all the things are subordinated to Him [the Son],
Then the Son Himself also will be subordinated

To the [One who] subordinated all the things to Him [the Son],
In order that the [Triune] God may be all things in all things.

1 *Cor.* xv. 24-28.

And we may note in conclusion, as another illustration of
St. Peter's dependence on this *Epistle to the Ephesians*,
that he speaks of Jesus Christ,

1 *Pet.* iii. 22. Who is at the right-hand of God,
Since He went into heaven,

When there were subjected to Him angels
And authorities and powers.

Eph. i. 22c, 23. The Christ and the Church.

The Messiah, the Christ, is seen by St. Paul as enthroned over the whole scale of creation, from soulless matter to immaterial souls, from the stone floor and iron chain of the Apostle's prison, and the trees on the hills, and the birds in the air, and the soldier beside him, to the angels in heaven. But his companions in front of him and the Laodicean Christians, whom he had never met, spoke of higher reaches in the scale of being. For the highest rung in the ladder of Creation is the Church ; and God has set the Risen Christ as Head of all Creation.

**Eph. i. 22c. And Him, He gave [as] Head
Over all things to the Church.**

The word " Him " is placed in an emphatic position in the Greek sentence, so we give it similar emphasis in the English one. And we note that the verb, " He gave," is not used in the present place merely for " He placed," though it sometimes has that meaning, as the Hebrew *nāthán*, " he gave " is sometimes used for *sûm*, " he placed."

No doubt, we have noted how St. Paul sometimes starts off at a word on a new theme. And now, having mentioned the Church, he will unfold it before resuming his main subject. Yet it would be an error to accuse the procedure of heedless digressions. On the contrary, these digressions and parentheses help to build up the structure of the argument, and to fill up the outline of the picture. The cumulative effect certainly justifies the process, which was almost inevitable in a man, who was writing swiftly and urgently, while his mind was flooded with all that revelation and meditation had given, and while his soul was aflame with the glory of God. Having now mentioned the Church, he will shew its relation to the Christ. But his apparent

digression will prepare the way for his exposition of God's power in the members of that Church.

God, then, gave the Christ as Head in all respects to the Church,

Eph. i. 23. Which [is such that it] is His Body,
The Fulness of Him, who is being filled as to
all the things in all [ways].

To render the compound relative *hē-tis*, we have used the expression, "which [is such that it]," because it compensates for its clumsiness by developing the real connection between the word and its antecedent. It is not merely that the Church is Messiah's Mystical Body, but that such is the character of the Church, and the reason for Messiah's special Headship of it. He is Head over all things for it, because He is its own Head.

In this encyclical, the Church will be compared to a Temple, of which our Lord is the Chief Corner-stone, *Eph. ii. 20*. It will also be described as our Lord's Bride, *Eph. v. 32*. This great figure will be developed fully thirty-four years later by St. John in his *Apocalypse* xix. 7, 8, xxi. 2, 9, xxii. 17. But at this moment, we are more concerned with the comparison of the Church to our Lord's Body.

Six years ago, in the autumn of 55, St. Paul, writing to the Corinthians from Ephesus, had compared the Church to the Body of Christ.

I Cor. xii. 12. For according as the body is one,
And has many members,

But all the members of the body—
Being many—are one body ;

So also is the Christ.

13. For in one Spirit also we all—
We were baptised into one body.

In this figure, the unity is produced by the Holy Spirit ; and the head is not the Christ, but one among the members. So it is said,

1 Cor. xii. 21. But the eye cannot say to the hand,
" I have no need of thee,"

Or again, the head to the feet,
" I have no need of you."

It will be noted that the Church is called " the Christ," 1 Cor. xii. 12e., as being His Mystical Body. The head is not our Lord ; but the head and the other members, taken together, compose that Mystical Body, which is called " the Christ."

Writing to the Romans from Corinth, in the January of 57, St. Paul employs the same figure, saying,

Rom. xii. 4. For according as we have many members in one body,
But the members all have not the same action ;

5. So we, the many, are one body in Christ,
But [one] by one, members of one another.

Now ancient writers, whose political conceptions were for the most part based on municipal life, readily enough saw the analogies between the city and the human body. The parallel was at hand for Menenius Agrippa, when the Roman patricians sent him to the Aventine hill in 494 B.C., to persuade the seceding plebeians to submit. So he was able to calm the conflict between the rich and the poor for a moment by comparing the former to a stomach and the latter to the limbs in need of it. But St. Paul does not merely compare the Church to a human body. Grace indeed builds on nature ; and nature had provided the comparison. The Apostle takes it, and adds the supernatural elements in the life of God the Holy Spirit, who

makes the Mystical Body one in the Christ, and makes it one as His Real Body is one. So in this metaphor, St. Paul does not represent our Lord as a part of the Body, but as the whole, just as He is the whole Vine, His disciples being branches in Him. He is not a part ; but all the parts are parts in Him.

During his imprisonment, in this spring of 61, St. Paul develops the figure. In its new form, it is not one of a complete body, animated by God the Holy Spirit, and the counterpart of our Lord's Real Body. The Christ is no longer the Mystical Body in the figure, but the Head of that Body. God, the Holy Spirit, is still the power and cause of unity ; but the union of our Lord with the Church is presented as that of a head with its limbs. So in the *Epistle to the Colossians*, St. Paul writes of our Lord,

Col. i. 18. And He Himself is the head of the body,
[The head] of the Church.

And now composing his encyclical, his mind still full of what he had said to the Colossians, he says of the Father,

Eph. i. 22b And He gave Him [the Messiah as] Head
Over all things to the Church,

23. Which [is such that it] is His Body.

So in the first *Epistle to the Corinthians* and in that to the *Romans*, the Church is represented figuratively by the whole body, both head and members. In the *Epistle to the Colossians* and the present encyclical, the Church is represented figuratively by the body, exclusive of the head. Towards the end of this encyclical, v. 23-29, St. Paul will use both figures. Speaking of husbands and wives, he will first of all compare the position of the husband to the Christ's position as Head of the Church ; and then He will

compare the position of the wife to that of the whole body, which is identified with the Messiah or Christ.

It is important to remember the connection between the *Epistle to the Colossians* and that *to the Ephesians*, for the words, which follow in the latter are the subject of much discussion. In the former epistle we read,

Col. i. 19. Because all the Fulness was well-pleased to dwell in Him,

and again,

Col. ii. 9. Because all the Fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily in Him ;
And you have been filled in Him.

Now, in the encyclical, we read of the Church as

Eph. i. 23. The Fulness of Him, who is being filled as to all the things in all [ways].

First of all, we note that the participle, rendered " filled " in *Col.* ii. 9, must be rendered passively as " filled " in *Eph.* i. 23, also, as was done by St. John Chrysostom and St. Jerome's Vulgate at the end of the fourth century. Secondly, the Greek word, *plērōma*, rendered " fulness," was used for a ship's " cargo " in the *Life of Moses*, written by Philo, who led the embassy of Alexandrian Jews to Rome at the beginning of 39 A.D. It was employed for a ship's " crew " in Xenophon's *Hellenica* I. vi. 16, about 380 B.C., and in the *Flinders Petrie Papyri* II. ix. 3, between 241 and 239 B.C. So the word is used for that which fills something. It is also used for that which fills up something, that is, for that which completes the filling. For example, Plato, in his *Republic*, 371 E, written not long after 386 B.C., speaks of wage-earners as a *pleroma* or " complementary portion " of the state. So in *Matt.* ix. 16, and *Mk.* ii. 21, the patch on a garment is called its *pleroma*, that which

fills it. Therefore, the word may be used for that which fills or completes, solely or partially. And so it is explained by St. Chrysostom, who is followed in this by Theodoret, Theodore, Œcumenius, Theophylact and Aquinas.

We have the more confidence in this conclusion, because it is drawn by the great school of literal interpretation. Founded at Syrian Antioch by Malchion in 269 A.D., it became more famous under Lucian, and attained much influence, when its chair was occupied by the emaciated form and rich learning of the Tarsian Diodore, in whose monastery St. Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia studied from 374 to 378 A.D.

In the *Epistle to the Colossians*, we have found the sentences,

Col. i. 19. All the *pleroma* was well-pleased to dwell in Him;
and

Col. ii. 9. All the *pleroma* of the Godhead dwells in Him bodily.

In the present encyclical, we shall read such expressions as

Eph. iii. 19. In order that you may be filled unto all the *pleroma*
of God,
and

Eph. iv. 13. Unto [the full] measure of [the] stature
Of the *pleroma* of Christ.

These passages speak of that, which fills God or the Christ. So the word *pleroma* will be understood by St. John. Having studied this encyclical, he will say in the fourth Gospel,

John i. 14. And the Word became flesh,
And among us tabernacled He—
(And we gazed at His glory,
Glory as of Soleborn from Father)—
Full of grace and truth.

Then he will record the Baptist's testimony :

John i. 15. The One coming after me
Has become before me,
Because He was prior to me.

And he will explain it by reference to his own statement in *John* i. 14, saying,

John i. 16. Because out of His *pleroma*,
We all received,
And grace [given] in return for grace [accepted].

It is unnecessary to pursue the question further. The Gnostic Valentinians will use the word *pleroma* for the aeons, which were thirty divine attributes and graces personified and represented as emanations from God. The Gnostic Cerinthians will apply it to the Divine Source Itself. But both cases will be examples of second century borrowings from St. Paul. They will illustrate, not his meaning, but the perversion of his meaning. So we may return to the line, which we would interpret. We note that it is parallel to the description of the Church as our Lord's Body ; and since the body completes the head, the Church is then spoken of as our Lord's complement, that which fills Him, His Fulness,

Eph. i. 23. The Fulness of Him, who is being filled as to all the things in all [ways].

To suppose that this implies any lack in our Lord, the Divine Word, is to miss the significance of the figure, which is used of our Lord in His particular office as the Christ, and in His particular relation to the Church as its Head. It is impossible to make a metaphor walk on all fours. And human language, applied to supernatural themes, must always lend itself to captious and querulous objection,

The use of such language at all is only justified by some analogy. So, in asserting the generation of the Son by the Father, we would express the relation between the First and Second Persons of the Ever-Blessed Trinity. The words do convey the Catholic doctrine of identical nature and distinct personality. But to extend the metaphor beyond the analogy, as did Arius, according to the *First Oration*, c. xxii., of St. Athanasius, when he argued that a son could not be as old as his parent, and as they do, who would press St. Paul's figurative language as to the Church beyond his evident intention, is to confess oneself on the logical level of a person, who would conclude that sweet music can sweeten tea.

We have already learned from the *Epistle to the Colossians* ii. 9, that all the Fulness of the Godhead dwells in the Christ bodily. That which dwells in our Lord is not that which the Godhead fills, but that which fills the Godhead. The expression is a bold one, even for St. Paul ; but it is plain. The Godhead is imaged as a receptacle ; all the Divine Being and Attributes, Essence and Grace, which fill it, dwell in the Christ. But even so, the Christ, as the Christ, is not complete. He must have a human nature, body and soul ; and therefore, the Fulness of the Godhead must dwell in Him bodily. Still, for all that, the Christ is not yet complete. To the Godhead and the Humanity must be added the Church, as the headless body to its head. The Church, therefore, is His Fulness, His complement, that which fills and completes Him.

The verb, which we have rendered "is being filled," must indeed be taken passively. So it is understood by Origen, according to Cramer's *Caténæ* of 1842, on *Ephesians*, pp. 129, 133 ; and he is supported by St. Chrysostom's comment on the passage. The Latin versions, the Bohairic version in Northern Egypt and the Sahidic in Southern,

and the Old Syriac version, as represented by Ephraem's commentary, take the same view. There is only one dissentient among the ancient versions, Rabbûla's Peshîta Syriac of 411, which interprets the Greek participle as active, "filling," instead of passive, "being filled."

Of course, our Lord is perfect, But, as we have seen, that is not the question here. Now, we are dealing with His Mystical Body and His channels of grace to the Universe. We are getting a glimpse of the Sacramental Order in the Universe, just as we had a glimpse of its Sacrificial Order in St. Paul's filling up the "deficits"

Col. i. 24. Of the afflictions of the Christ.

The Athenian Clement, who became head of the catechetical school in Alexandria in 189, wrote in his *Selections out of the Prophetic Writings*, xxiii., "Even as the Saviour used to speak and heal by means of His body, so also did He formerly by means of the [Jewish] prophets, but now by means of the apostles and teachers." And St. Clement argues that the philanthropic God invests Himself with Man for the salvation of men, formerly with the prophets, but now with the Church. Origen, who succeeded St. Clement in 203, finely illustrates the word "being filled" by a king, who is filled with kingdom in the extension of his dominion; and he explains the passage by the completion of our Lord's Body through those, who come to Him.

Even so, the Christ is not completed. Besides the God-head, Humanity and the Church, the whole Universe, is in the Christ. So we read in the parallel passage of the *Epistle to the Colossians*,

Col. i. 16. All the things—by means of Him,
And unto Him—have been created ;

17. And He Himself is before all things ;
And all the things stand together in Him.

The Greek word for "all things" has the article, which we preserve in English. And we have already explained that our English phrase, "all the things," is to be taken in the sense of the Greek expression as suggesting "all things as a whole." These, finding their unity in the Christ, are a complement of Him, and are summarised, *Eph.* i. 10, in Him,

Eph. i. 23. Who is being filled with all the things in all [ways].

If it is necessary to defend our translation of this line against the objection that the words *ta panta*, "all the things," are in the accusative case, and therefore, ought not to be rendered "with all the things" after the verb, "being filled," we answer that St. Paul will dictate a similar construction within some months, for he will describe the Philippians, i. 11, as "filled with fruit of justice." There, according to the true text, the word for "fruit" is in the accusative. We could, of course, render the phrase, "filled as regards fruit." But that would imply "filled with fruit." Indeed, St. Paul has just written in

Col. i. 9. In order that you may be filled with the full-knowledge of His will.

And there, the word for "full-knowledge" is in the accusative.

So the doxology, *Eph.* i. 21-23, has proclaimed the supremacy of the Christ over the Universe and the Church. It has in each of these indicated its motive and mode of true existence as His instrument and tributary. He is the centre of all. And in Him meet Heaven and Earth, Eternity and Time, Creator and Creation.

The other aspect of the Christ, in which He is seen as the Source rather than as the Goal, will appear later, when we shall read of His ascent above all the heavens,

Eph. iv. 10. In order that He may fill all the things,

CHAPTER II

GOD'S WORK.

The Apostle has shewn the power of God in the Resurrection and Exaltation of the Christ. Now, he will proceed to shew it in the spiritual resurrection and exaltation of those, who form Messiah's Mystical Body, the Church. He will do this in four stages, dealing respectively with the Gentiles, ii. 1, 2, the Jews ii. 3, the Church of God, ii. 4-6, and the principles of grace and faith, ii. 7-10. So a little more than four years ago, in January, 57, in his *Epistle to the Romans*, he dealt first with the Gentiles, i. 18-32, secondly with the Jews, ii., iii. 1-20, thirdly with the justified, iii. 21-31, and fourthly with the principles of grace and faith, iv.

Eph. ii. 1, 2. The Gentiles.

The sequence of St. Paul's speech is interrupted by a flood of thought and emotion, when the mention of the Gentiles awakens the antipathy of his Pharisaic nationalism and Jewish morality, and the sympathy of his Greek culture and Apostolic commission. In this, as in every word he writes, he illustrates the principle that God's inspiration, like all God's grace, builds on nature.

Now, with his heart outstretched beyond Ephesus to the churches of the Lycus Valley and to men, whom he had

never seen, he would speak of God, who had raised the Christ from the dead ;

And with the Christ, He co-vivified you, .
[You] being dead in respect of your lapses and sins.

But he omits the words, " with the Christ, He co-vivified," or " He made alive together with the Christ." And yet he retains the pronoun " you " in the accusative case. So the lines take form as

Eph. ii. 1. And you—
Being dead in respect of your lapses and sins.

There is no doubt that the verb to be supplied as governing " you " is " He co-vivified " or " made alive together," for we shall find it expressed later,

Eph. ii. 5. And us, being dead in respect of the lapses,
He co-vivified with the Christ.

Indeed, it has already been made explicit in the *Epistle to the Colossians*,

Col. ii. 13. And you [accusative]—
Being dead in respect of the lapses,

And in respect of the uncircumcision of your flesh—
He co-vivified you with Him.

The state of death, to which St. Paul points, is clearly not death in respect of physical state, nor that in respect of and due to original sin, the " sin of origin," which belongs to human beings as children of Adam. It is a death in respect of lapses and sins, that is to say, it is a state, in which lapses and sins are the conditioning circumstances, or rather, constitute that, in which the death consists, for the Greek nouns are in the dative without the preposition " in." So it is that state, in which its own malice

has turned the soul from God as its Final End and Goal, and taken the very powers and instruments, which He had placed at its disposal, and used them to lessen the external glory of God. Just as we need God's creative power, that we may exist, so we need His concurrent power that we may act. And the essential malice of sin consists in perverse choice by that free-will, which He gave us for His own greater glory as the recipient of voluntary homage, and for our greater blessedness, as God's volunteers, and not His slaves. For by that perverse choice, we pervert His concurrent activity against Himself. It is as if a clerk, taken into partnership and freely presented with a large sum, were to use the position and the money to injure his benefactor.

Violating the moral order, and transgressing God's law, that malice attains its complete expression, when it refuses supernatural means for reaching supernatural life. Dead then as to the supernatural life, and perverted in will, the soul becomes blinded in intellect and futile in its opinionated reasonings, *Rom. i. 21*. Then the body suffers degradation, *Rom. i. 24*, the soul's perverse will and blinded intellect loosing the passions to riot and to produce disease and physical death.

It is more than hinted from time to time, that St. Paul's picture of the Pagan world was exaggerated. We certainly do not confirm that picture by the verses of satirists, any more than we should accept Pope's satires as a mirror of England under George II. And we readily admit that the intense nationalism of a Pharisee and the traditional struggle of a Jew against Greek customs might prejudice such a one against everything Gentile. But idyllic poets, heroic warriors and stoic philosophers were too few and far between to relieve the foul gloom of pagan slavery and pagan idolatry. A Stoic, who was about this very time

writing the *Letters of Heracleitus* at Ephesus, could be moved with fierce indignation by the spectacle of vicious idolatry and passionate violence. And the fierce scorn of his seventh letter was never provoked by exigences of literary satire.

Surely then a Jew, devoted from his youth in utter loyalty to the highest that he knew, and fencing the Law by adding prohibitions to protect it against transgression, would naturally and rightly shudder at the unrestrained passions of paganism. He, who had inherited the psalms and prophecies of Monotheist Israel, would be as much repelled by the hopes and sentiments of Gentiles, as a clerical student of to-day by the conversation too frequent in smoking-rooms and such places. But the best comment on the Pauline view would be the evidence of an Indian or Chinese convert to Christianity. That would show what St. Paul implied, when he reminded his readers of the lapses and the sins,

**Eph. ii. 2. In which you sometime walked
According to the age of this world.**

The word "which" is feminine in agreement with "sins," but it refers to both the "lapses" and "the sins." The verb, rendered "walked," does not here mean "walked about," as it is used for the Hebrew *hālākh*, "to walk," or "to follow a manner of life." In *Mark* vii. 5, *Acts* xxi. 21 and *Hebrews* xiii. 9, the figure is limited to a walk in a definite line of conduct. But here, as in *St. John's Gospel* and *Epistles*, the figure is extended to conduct in general. In the phrase, "the age of this world," St. Paul combines two expressions, "this age" and "this world," as he has combined "good pleasure" and "will" in *Eph.* i. 5, "counsel" and "will" in *Eph.* i. 11, "activity," "might"

and "strength" in *Eph.* i. 19, the combination being more impressive than the single word. And it is plain that "the age of this world" means "the course of this world," "the present age," the present period of revolt against God or of indifference to Him, through which this world, this organisation of merely human aims and lives, is passing.

But the state of paganism in St. Paul's day and in ours witnesses not only to foulness and violence, but also to the worship of demons. And as St. Paul traces the Gentile degradation to perverted will, so he now traces that perversion of the will to a personal and evil spirit. In *Eph.* iv. 24, "according to God," means "in accordance with God's will." So

Eph. ii. 2. According to the age of this world,

means "in accordance with its will." And that accordance with its will is now explained as

Eph. ii. 2c. According to the prince of the authority of
the air,
Of the spirit, of the [spirit] now active in the
sons of disobedience.

Now, he who is prince, or ruler, or chief, in regard to the authority of the air, is explained in the parallel line as Satan, the spirit, who is now active in rebels against God. The phrase "the authority of the air" defines "the prince." The prince is he who has the authority of the air. Then the phrase "of the spirit" defines "the authority." The authority is the authority of the rebel spirit. Therefore, the spirit is the same person as the prince. So the lines mean that the converts from the Gentiles had conducted

themselves according to the will of worldly men, and therefore,

According to the will of him, who had the authority of the air,
That is, according to the will of the spirit, who now impels the
men in revolt against God.

We must, however, note the expressions, "the authority of the air," and "the sons of disobedience." The latter is simply a Hebraism for "disobedient men," as the well-known "sons of Belial," that is, sons of *b'li ya'al*, "sons of without-worth" or "sons of worthlessness" is a Hebraism for "worthless men."

The former phrase, "the authority of the air," is not to be explained by the distinction between the Greek *aithēr*, the ether or upper air, and the Greek *aēr*, the lower air or atmosphere, Homer's *Iliad*, xiv. 288. Nor is it necessary to appeal to Pythagoras, about 529 B.C., and his doctrine, according to Diogenes Laertius, viii. 32, about 150 A.D., that all the air is full of souls. Nor again can we trace St. Paul's expression to the phrase, "by the aerial spirit, Beliar," in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, "Benjamin," iii., a work written originally in Hebrew between 109 and 105 B.C., but suffering interpolation during the next five centuries. Among such interpolations, we may include the phrase, which we have just quoted, the adjective "aerial" being suggested by our present passage, *Eph.* ii. 2c., and the name "Beliar" being taken from 2 *Cor.* vi. 15, where it represents the darkness, opposed to the Christ, who is the light. When it is said in the *Ascension of Isaiah* vii., that Isaiah beheld Sammael, that is Satan, and his powers in the firmament, we must remember that the statement occurs in the "Vision," cc. vi.-xi., which was written after Domitian's accession in 81 A.D. Philo, who was in Rome early in 39 A.D., said in his treatise

on *Dreams*, that the air is like a populous city, as it contains souls, equal in number to the stars. The doctrine, as we have seen, is Pythagorean; and very Pythagorean is the numerical determination. In Philo's view, some of these souls are disembodied, and others unembodied. He prefers to call the more excellent of them by the Scriptural name of "angels" than to join the philosophers in calling them "demons," a statement which he repeats in his little treatise *on the Giants*, ii.

It is sufficient to regard St. Paul as speaking according to a quite natural figure, of which the Thessalian Œcumenius at the end of the sixth century suggests the explanation. Satan's sphere, the Apostle would imply, as St. John explicitly teaches, *Apoc.* xii. 9, and as indeed our Lord had shewn, *Luke* x. 18, is no longer in heaven. As St. Paul, whose special aim it is to make the Roman Empire the Empire of Christ, holds that Messiah's conquest of this earth is already implied in His Crucifixion and Resurrection, it is impossible to concede to Satan any legitimate sphere on earth. And therefore, his authority is defined figuratively by the air.

The word, "authority," implies more than "force," and indicates a rule over rational beings. Therefore, Satan is represented as having a kingdom, *Matt.* xii. 26, and authority, *Acts* xxvi. 18. This rule is exercised now in the souls of those, who disobey God, as it was sometime, formerly, in the souls of those who now no longer walk according to the age or course of this world.

Eph. ii. 3. The Jews

St. Paul does not now dwell long on the state of the Gentiles, lest he should offend the majority of his readers. Nor would he lose the true perspective in his picture of God's power, active in all the Christ's members, whether

drawn from the Gentiles or from the Jews. As he has just mentioned the rebels against God, he adds,

Eph. ii. 3. Among whom we [Jews] also—all—
We moved about sometime

In the desires of our flesh,
Doing the wills of the flesh and of the minds.

And we were children—naturally—of wrath,
As also the rest.

We note that when St. Paul referred to the Gentiles, he spoke of the lapses and the sins,

Eph. ii. 2. In which you sometime walked.

And now referring to the Jews, he speaks of the rebels,

Eph. ii. 3. Among whom we [Jews] also—all—
We moved about sometime.

The verb "walked" is more suitable in the former case, and suggests individual paths. But the verb "moved about" or "had intercourse" is more suitable for social relationships. It is tempting to follow Armitage Robinson, p. 155, in explaining the Greek as "in *which*" to make a parallel with the clause,

Eph. ii. 2. In which you sometime walked.

But the change of verb and the close grammatical connection between the relative and the word for "sons" compel us to render the phrase as "in *whom*," that is, "among whom."

With regard to the Jews, St. Paul adds the word "all" to indicate the universal apostasy of the Jews. So "both Jews and Greeks are all under sin," *Rom.* iii. 9. In such

a way, a basis is laid for a single method of restoration. And of course, it is the general rule, that is in question, not such special cases as that of our Lord, or His holy mother, who was protected from original and actual sin for the sake of Her Divine Son's merits and glory.

The life of the Jew then expressed the "desires of the flesh." The "flesh," of course, primarily means the muscular integument, *Luke* xxiv. 39, then the body, *Col.* i. 22, thirdly, the living body and soul, *John* i. 14, fourthly, the bodily appetites and passions, *John* i, 13, and finally, fallen humanity, weakened physically, morally and intellectually by original sin, and opposed both to the Divine Spirit, *Rom.* viii. 9, and to the regenerate intelligence and personality, *Rom.* vii. 18.

The Jews, then, lived doing "the wills," that is, "the things willed" of the flesh and of the minds. "The flesh and the minds" may seem a strange expression. In the Greek Vulgate, the word here rendered "mind," *dianoia*, has been used thirty-eight times to render the Hebrew word *lēbh* or *lēbhābh*, ordinarily translated by the Greek word *kardia*, "a heart." In *Eph.* iv. 17, 18, St. Paul will bid his readers walk no longer

17d. According as the nations also are walking—

In vanity of their intelligence,

18. Having been darkened in the mind.

In that case, *dianoia*, "mind," as the reasoning faculty, will be set against *nous*, the intuitive intelligence. But ordinarily, in the Greek Testament, the word means "mind" simply; and therefore, we have rendered the line as

Eph. ii. 3d. Doing the wills of the flesh and of the minds.

By "the flesh," then, we must understand the passions,

so that the whole phrase includes both sensual and intellectual sins. And at the same time, it explains and is parallel to the line,

Eph. ii. 3c. In the desires of our flesh.

Now the Apostle finally sums up the state of the Jews, affirming it to be that of all other men. He speaks of them as "children of wrath." The phrase is a Hebraism, as a "son of smiting" means "a man worthy of smiting" or "to be smitten," in *Deut.* xxv. 2; and a "son of death" means "a man worthy of death," in 1 *Sam.* xx. 31, xxvi. 16, and 2 *Sam.* xii. 5, and "a man under doom of death," in *Ps.* lxxix. 11, cii. 20. So in the present place, "children of wrath" means "men worthy of wrath," or "men under the doom of wrath." And St. Chrysostom explains the sentence by saying, "we all used to practise things worthy of wrath."

In speaking of God's wrath, it is plain, as Origen, *Against Celsus*, iv. 72, St. Chrysostom, *on Ps. vii. n.* 6, St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Migne*, lxxvii. 1276, and St. John of Damascus, *On the Orthodox Faith*, i. 11, among the Greeks, and St. Hilary, *On Ps. ii., n.* 17, St. Ambrose, *On Noah*, iv. 9, and St. Augustine, both in his *City of God*, xv. 25, and in his work *On the Trinity*, XIII. xvi. 21, among the Latins, were careful to point out, that the phrase "the wrath of God" must not be interpreted as implying trouble or disturbance in the Eternal and Unchangeable God, but as an anthropomorphism for the punishment, which vindicates God's purpose opposed, God's law transgressed and God's Holiness insulted.

When St. Paul says that the Jews were worthy of wrath "as also the rest," he uses a phrase, which he employed nine years earlier, in May 52, when he was forbidding the Thessalonian Christians to sorrow for the dead, "as also

the rest, who have not hope," 1 *Thess.* iv. 13. Here, too, the expression covers the pagan world ; and the sentence levels Judaism to that sphere.

But there remains a very serious question. In what sense can it be said that both Jews and Gentiles are by nature worthy of wrath ? St. Augustine, in his controversy with the Pelagians, interpreted the phrase of original sin, the sin of origin. And in this, the great African has been followed by most commentators. Adam had indeed been ennobled with supernatural nobility, and admitted to the court of the heavenly king. Privileges were given him for himself and his children on condition of his loyalty. His wife sinned the first actual sin in the human race, and lost her standing. Still, that did not affect the family, which held its dignity through its head. But Adam proved disloyal, and lost the supernatural privileges. Excluded from the court, he, perverted in will and injured in intellect, became the parent of children, who, like himself, were

Despoiled of supernatural [graces],
And wounded in natural [powers],

Gen. viii. 21, *Matt.* xv. 19. So they were worthy of wrath. But the love of the Heavenly King ever followed them. His ambassadors spoke in the starry heavens above and in the moral law within, as in the works of His special providence and in the words of His inspired prophets. Yet so often, the perverted wills of the exiles refused submission, adding actual sin to original.

Can we, however, say that the phrase, "children—by nature—of wrath," means "men—by origin—worthy of wrath?" It is true that the Apostle had been dealing with the actual sins of Gentiles and Jews, of the nations and the nation. It is also true that he had been speaking of the time, previous to their reception into the Church.

Still, nothing prevented his speaking of the original sin, which existed during that period, or his adding a mention of it to the account of actual sins.

Further, the word *phusei*, "by nature," seems to have a very emphatic position between "children" and "of wrath." This striking and original order of the words is found in four places of Origen's works, i. 557, iii. 460, iv. 350, and according to his Latin interpreter, iv. 503. So we may regard that as the order read by him, during his presidency at Alexandria, from 203 to 231, notwithstanding the smoother order of the words, found in iv. 340 and Cramer's *Caténæ* of 1842, vi., p. 137. The emphatic and unusual order is also preserved in the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, both of 331, a century after Origen, and in the Syrian text of the Moscovian K, Cent. ix, and of St. Chrysostom, xxviii. 30, before 398, who is followed by the Damascene about 717. It is found again in the cursives, the Alexandrian 17, of Cent. ix. or x., and 47, of Cent. xi.

Naturally, a translator would prefer the smooth order, unless he should omit the awkward word *phusei*, "by nature," as in the Ethiopic version of 600. The latter method is adopted by St. Clement of Alexandria, 23, 560, about 189 A.D., and the cursive, 109, of Cent. xiii. or xiv. Tertullian, indeed, must be counted a witness to the unusual order, because he retains it in his Latin, *Against Marcion*, v. 17, about 207-208, A.D., though he smooths the passage in his treatise *On the Soul*, xvi. 21.

Because of a translator's tendency to smooth his rendering, we are not surprised to find the word *phusei*, "by nature," placed before "children of wrath" in the Old Latin, the Latin Vulgate, the Bohairic Egyptian, the Harclean Syriac, the Gothic, and in the Latin texts, used by Victorinus at Rome about 360, and by his contemporary, Lucifer of

Cagliari, in Sardinia, who died in 371. We know that the Western manuscripts, the Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., its copy, the Sangerman E. of Cent. ix., and the twin uncials, the Augien F and the Boërnerian G, both of Cent. ix., have in some places suffered assimilation to their Latin versions; and it may well be that their smooth reading, placing *phusei*, "by nature," before *tekna*, "children," is due to the influence of their Latin columns, rather than to the copyists' taste in Greek prose.

But the grammarians' pen, which produced the "Alexandrian" form of text, seems to have made the change in the Alexandrian A, of Cent. v. We find it again in the Angelic L and the Porphyrian P, both of Cent. ix., as well as in cursives, 80, of Cent. xi., 3 of Cent. xii., 116 of Cent. xiii., 108 of Cent. xiv., 37 and 106 of Cent. xv. It is adopted by the Alexandrian Didymus, whose life was nearly coeval with the fourth century; by the Syrian Theodoret about 423, and by the Alexandrian Euthalius in 458. St. Cyril of Alexandria, between 417 and 428, in his commentary on *St. John*, 175, varied the procedure by placing the word, *phusei*, "by nature," at the end of the phrase, after "wrath."

Having found the place, we needs must find the meaning of *phusei*, "by nature." If it is opposed to "by act," and implies "by birth," or "by constitution," then we must explain the word by origin, and the whole phrase by original sin. Attic examples are of little use for our immediate purpose. Rickaby, in his note on the passage, quotes the phrase *phusei kinados*, "a thorough fox," literally, a fox or wily fellow by nature. And Abbott suggests Xenophon's expression, "by nature most fond of farming," *Æconomics*, xx. 25. Josephus indeed, in 93 A.D., describes David as "naturally just and God-fearing,"

and the Pharisees as "naturally moderate," *Antiquities*, VII. vii. 1, XIII. x. 6. But the Pauline sense of the word must be determined by the Pauline use.

In *Rom.* ii. 14, it is taught that Gentiles sometimes do the things of the law by nature, that is, without revelation. As St. Augustine, in 390 A.D., in his treatise *on the Spirit and the Letter*, § 27, pointed out, it does not mean that they did so without grace. The word for "by nature" is therefore opposed to that for "by revelation." In *Gal.* ii. 15, St. Paul speaks of those, who are "Jews by nature," as distinguished from proselytes, the word for "by nature" being therefore equivalent to that for "by birth." In *Gal.* iv. 8, according to the better reading, we learn of those, who are not gods by nature, that is "by constitution," "in reality" and "essentially." It would therefore appear that in this, *Eph.* ii. 3e, the fourth and final instance of the word in his writings, St. Paul implies a state, not an act, a state of nature and constitution, and not a state produced by one's own act. And therefore, his whole phrase, "children—by nature—of wrath," means "men under the doom of wrath in the state, which results from their origin." As to the word *tekna*, "children," in such a phrase, it, like *huiοί*, "sons" in the phrase, "sons of disobedience," represents the Hebrew, *b'nê*, "sons of," and has no more to do with age than the word "children" in the phrase, "the children of Israel."

It is not ours at this moment, and in this place, to vindicate the justice of God in such a matter. The natural order presents analogous conditions in the children of a vicious parent. With regard to the supernatural order, it must be remembered that healing is always at hand, for God would have all men saved, 1 *Tim.* ii. 4; and being Lord of all [men], He is wealthy unto all [men] who invoke Him, *Rom.* x. 12.

Eph. ii. 4-7. The Church.

The power of God was abundantly proved in the Resurrection and Supreme Exaltation of our Lord, the Messiah or Christ. It is now to be proved in the spiritual resurrection and exaltation of the Christ's members, who form His Church. The greatness of the power is the more manifest on account of the state, in which both Gentiles and Jews were lying. And not power alone, but mercy and love are shewn in that generous activity, which not only vivified, raised, and seated the Messiah in the heavenlies, but also vivified, raised and seated with Him those, who were dead in respect of supernatural life and activity. Or, to express it in Pauline language,

ii. 4 But God—being wealthy in mercy,

On account of His much love,

With which He loved us—

5. Us—even being dead with respect to lapses—

He co-vivified with the Christ—

(You have been delivered by grace)—

6. And He co-raised and co-seated [us with Him]

In the heavenlies,

In Christ Jesus.

If we omit the parenthetic sentence, "you have been delivered by grace," which will be repeated and enlarged in *Eph.* ii. 8, we may write out this passage in an order, which will deprive it of much emphasis and rugged sincerity, but may present its meaning more simply. Then we should read: "But God, being wealthy in mercy, on account of the much love with which He loved us, co-vivified us with the Christ, even when we were dead with respect

to the lapses ; and He co-raised us with the Christ, and co-seated us with Him in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus."

In Attic Greek, the word "wealthy" would be followed by the genitive of the wealth. But in the Greek Testament, it is followed as here and in *James* ii. 5, by the preposition "in." So it copies the Hebrew construction, found in *Gen.* xiii. 2, and *Prov.* xxviii. 11. "With which," in the third line, renders a relative pronoun in the accusative, a cognate accusative. And the aorist, or indefinite past tense, in "co-vivified," is certainly not intended for the future. Nor does it represent a "prophetic past," in which the future is spoken of as past, to imply the certainty of the event. It simply states what has already taken place in the sanctification of the souls in question, and describes their admission to participation in the Divine Nature.

Further, the co-vivifying is here pictured as "with the Christ," not "in the Christ," *Eph.* ii. 5 b. Unfortunately, *en*, "in," appears in the Vatican B and the cursive 17. Apparently, it was in the Greek text, used by St. Chrysostom and St. John Damascene, and by the translators of the Bohairic and Armenian versions. It crept into the Latin version, used by Victorinus, Ambrosiaster and St. Ambrose, and even against the weight of Vulgate manuscripts into the Clementine Vulgate of 1592. But it was not found in the Fuldensis, Amiatinus or Demidovianus copies of that Vulgate, nor in the Peshitta or the Harclean Syriac, nor in St. Clement of Alexandria. It was really obtained by dittography, that is, by an erroneous doubling of the *-en* at the end of the word for "He co-vivified," *sun-ezōo-poiēsen*.

Resuming the argument, we note that God's love is the primal and ultimate cause. It was that love of God for the ancient Israel, which was the motive of His delivering

them from Egypt, *Deut.* vii. 8. And now, His love is the cause of His mercy, which again is the motive of His delivering us from the death of sin. He was not influenced by the number of ancient Israel, for they were the least of all the peoples, *Deut.* vii. 7; nor by any good act on our part, for we were dead. Yet He not only delivered us from the death of sin, and seated us in the heavenlies *with* the glorified Christ, but He also did so *in* the Christ. So we are both with the Christ as His companions and in Him as His Body's members. This is made more emphatic by the use of the verbs, "co-raised" and "co-seated," *Eph.* ii. 6, as they recall the simple forms, "raised" and "seated," used of our Lord in *Eph.* i. 20.

Because Christians have been raised with the Christ spiritually, mystically indeed but really, St. Paul has just urged the Colossians to a life in accordance with their new world. He has argued,

Col. iii. 1. If, therefore, you were co-raised with the Christ,
Be seeking the things upward,

Where the Christ is,
Seated at the right-hand of God.

Further, in that epistle, he has connected the new resurrection life with baptism, saying,

Col. ii. 12. When you were co-buried with Him [the Christ] in the
baptism,
In which you were also co-raised [with Him]
By means of the faith of [that is, in] the activity of
God,
Who raised Him from among dead [men].

These figurative ways of describing the sacramental communication of sanctifying grace and the mystical union of souls with our Lord, are somewhat different from

that which the Apostle had used a little more than four years ago, in the January of 57, when he wrote to the Roman Christians. Then the death was indeed pictured as a death with respect to sin, but it was found under the baptismal waters. The resurrection was from these waters to a new life, not in the heavenlies, but on earth.

Rom. vi. 2. We who [are such as] died with respect to sin,
How shall we still live in it?

3. Or are you ignorant that we, as many as were baptised into [union with] Christ Jesus,
Were baptised into [union with] His death?

4. We were therefore co-buried with Him
By means of the baptism into [union with] the death,

In order that—even as Christ was raised from among dead [men]

By means of the glory of the Father,—

So also we—

We might walk in freshness of life.

The resurrection and glorification of the body is of course still future, as it is said,

Rom. vi. 5. For if we have become grown-into-one [as a graft with a tree] with the likeness of His Death,
But we shall also be [so with the likeness] of the Resurrection.

However, the life of mystical but real union with our Lord is also viewed in its future and heavenly realisation, when St. Paul says,

Rom. vi. 8. But if we died with Christ,
We believe that we shall also co-live with Him.

It is interesting to compare the Colossian and Ephesian verses, not only with those written four years earlier in

the *Epistle to the Romans*, but also with those written four years later in the *Epistle to Titus*, composed in the autumn of 65 A.D. The latter are connected with the present passage of the encyclical by their reference to the kindness and mercy of God, and by their identical doctrine as to grace and works. In them, St. Paul will write,

Tit. iii. 3. For we were sometime—we also—
Unintelligent, disobedient, misled,

Serving various desires and [sensual] pleasures,
Passing [our life] in malice and envy,

Abhorred,
Hating one another.

4. But when the kindness and the love-for-men
Of our Deliverer God was manifested—

5. Not [on the principle] of works, of the [works done] in
justice, which we did—we—
But according to His own mercy He delivered us

By means of a washing of regeneration
And renewing of [the power of the] Holy Spirit,

6. Of which [power of the Holy Spirit] He out-poured on
us wealthily
By means of Jesus Christ, our Deliverer,

7. In order that, when we were justified by the grace
of That One, [God],
We might become possessors—according to hope—
of eternal life.

But in the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, we have found the eternal purpose of God, as seen in its eternal fulfilment. It presents the Church, as it is in the Christ in heaven, not the Christ as He is in the Church on earth. And in its account of that Church, we find the four metaphysical principles or causes, which Aristotle, in his *Metaphysics*,

xi. 4, had taught us to expect. That philosopher explained the house by its material cause in the bricks, its formal cause in the idea of it, its efficient cause in the builder, and its final cause in the actual house, as realising the builder's purpose. So St. Paul explains the Church by its material cause in the persons, chosen from Gentiles and Jews, by its formal cause in the Mystical Body, of which the Messiah or Christ, Incarnate God, is the Head, by its efficient cause in the power of God, which vivified, raised and seated the Christ as supreme in the heavenlies, and by its final cause in the office of that Mystical Body, as the revelation of the Divine goodness and the channel of the Divine Grace. The final cause is essential to the account, as the acorn, for example, is not explained, till the potential oak, within it and without it, has been added to its chemical constitution, physical appearance and biological history. Therefore, St. Paul completes his description of the Church by saying that God so elevated us, chosen from Gentiles and Jews,

**Eph. ii. 7. In order that He might exhibit in the ages,
the [ages] coming upon [us],
The exceeding wealth of His grace**

**In kindness toward us
In Christ Jesus.**

The world to come is not a monotonous stretch of time. As the life of God is pure activity without any element of inertia, or passivity, the life of those who will share in the Divine Nature will be active. To us, wearied with labour, and burdened with care, heaven naturally becomes a symbol of rest. But labour implies a strength, unequal to perfect mastery of the work ; and the good, opposed to it, is not rest or inactivity, but the play of an artist or a child. So we may picture the life of God as one of play.

And the life of the Church in heaven may be imaged as that of God's kindergarten, the knowledge of Him ever growing deeper, the vision of Him ever growing fuller, and His glory ever growing brighter. We cannot describe that life; but such an expression as "the ages" implies a history of period after period, in which God will more and more exhibit the overflowing wealth of His grace by kindness to those in union with His Incarnate Son.

The word for "He might exhibit" is in the middle or reflexive form; but this is equivalent to the active in the Greek Testament, as we may see by an examination of the passages, in which it is found, *Rom.* ii. 15, ix. 17, 22, *2 Cor.* viii. 24, *Eph.* ii. 7, *1 Tim.* i. 16, *2 Tim.* iv. 14, *Tit.* ii. 10, iii. 2, *Heb.* vi. 10, 11. Indeed, it is unnecessary to say that God will exhibit the exceeding wealth of His grace for Himself, that is, for His own glory. God, as the Highest and Final Good, must be His own object, as well as that of His creatures' activity.

Eph. ii. 8-10. Grace.

Having told his readers how God will exhibit the wealth of His own grace in the coming ages, St. Paul would explain the nature of that grace. He has already interjected the sentence, "you have been delivered by grace," *Eph.* ii. 5. Now he resumes that statement, and enlarges it, speaking of "the grace" and saying,

**Eph. ii. 8. For you have been delivered by the grace
By means of faith—**

(And this [fact was] not out of you :
God's is the gift)—

- 9. Not out of works :
In order that no one may boast.**

The Church in glory will exhibit the wealth of God's grace, as St. Paul has declared. It will do so, as owing the deliverance of its members to that grace. Therefore, St. Paul adds,

Eph. ii. 8. For you have been delivered by the grace,

the conjunction, "for," indicating the reason. He has already said,

Eph. ii. 5. You have been delivered by grace.

Now he adds that it is "by means of faith." So, he had said,

Rom. iii. 28. For we count that a man is justified by faith,
Apart from works of law.

In that statement, Luther inserted the word, "alone," so that a man would appear to be justified by faith alone. With how little reason such a statement would be made, is evident on consideration of other passages. All is indeed of God, who sends His message. It is St. Paul himself who asks,

Rom. x. 14. How therefore may they invoke [Him],
On whom they did not believe ?

But how may they believe [Him],
Whom they did not hear ?

But how may they hear [Him],
Apart from [one] proclaiming [Him] ?

15. And how may they proclaim [Him],
Except they were sent ?

Then there is needed the actual grace of faith. For belief is an intellectual act, the intellect assenting to a divine truth under the direction of the will. But in that

act, the will is moved by grace, the grace of faith, described by St. Thomas Aquinas, in his *Summa*, 2 a. 2 æ. q. 2, art. 9, adj. 3, as "an internal impulse of God, [who is] inviting."

The fear of God also is a necessary disposition for justification, as it is the beginning of wisdom, *Ps.* cxi. 10, and *Prov.* ix. 10. And it was St. Paul himself, in that very *Epistle to the Romans*, who made hope such a necessary disposition, saying,

Rom. viii. 24. For we were delivered by the hope.

Love is clearly another necessary disposition, for St. John says,

1 John, iii. 14. He, who does not love, remains in the death.

Further, penitence also is a necessary disposition, for our Lord Himself said,

Luke xiii. 3. No, I say to you, but except you are penitent,
You will all perish in like manner.

Finally, a will to receive baptism is a necessary disposition, for again our Lord said,

Mark xvi. 16. He, who believed and was baptised, will be delivered.

And where He required belief and baptism, it is not for those, who profess themselves His followers, to require belief alone.

St. Paul, having said,

Eph. ii. 8. For you have been delivered by the grace
By means of faith,

would make the second line clearer by adding "not out of works," that is, not proceeding from or on the principle

of works. But having mentioned faith, he breaks in with the abrupt sentences,

Eph. ii. 8c. And this [was] not out of you :
God's is the gift.

But what does he mean by "this," which did not proceed out of them, just as their deliverance did not proceed out of their works? Some would have it that "this" refers to "faith"; and others explain it by "grace." But "this" is neuter in Greek. Both "grace" and "faith" are feminine. And certainly, it would be unreasonable to refer "this" to the more distant word, "grace." St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, Theodoret, Erasmus and Bengel refer "this" to "faith." In a free style, no doubt, the neuter "this" might point to the feminine "faith." But St. Chrysostom is asking how faith delivers without works. In answering that this very thing is God's gift, he really implies that "this" refers not to faith only, but to deliverance by grace through faith. So Theophylact explains the gift as "the being delivered by means of faith."

If we examine other Pauline passages, in which the neuter "this" is so used, we shall see it refers to the preceding sentence, not to the preceding word. For example, we read,

1. Cor. vi. 8. But you wrong and defraud—
And this—[your] brothers.

Again, St. Paul will write,

Phil. i. 28. And not being frightened in anything by the opposers,
Which is to them an exhibition of destruction,
But [is really an exhibition] of your deliverance—
And this—from God.

So the deliverance by the grace through the faith did not proceed "out of" the delivered, but was God's gift. He did not impose on men the impossible task of being

their own deliverers. A man spiritually dead could no more restore himself to spiritual life, than a man naturally dead could restore himself to natural life by his own efforts, or a man on the earth lift himself to the moon by pulling at the collar of his own coat. Nor could he, by actions of the natural order, merit the least supernatural grace and help to perform one action of the supernatural order. For such merit would imply some proportion between the act and its reward, and there is no proportion here. Were it otherwise, then the delivered or saved and justified man might boast, as Gideon's original army might have boasted, saying, "My hand delivered me," *Judges* vii. 2. And under the New Testament dispensation, with its fuller revelation of God's power, wisdom and holiness, independence and self-assertion on the part of His creatures is even less permissible. Accordingly, God chose the chief disciples of His Messiah in the first age, and the truest disciples of His Messiah in all ages since, among those, whom the world held foolish, weak and ignoble,

1. Cor. i. 29. That no flesh might boast before God.

Therefore the deliverance of the justified was by grace through faith,

Eph. ii. 9. Not [proceeding] out of works,
In order that no one may boast.

In dealing with the justification of Jews, St. Paul had, in *Rom.* iii. 28, used the expression, "works of law." But now, as he is dealing with the justification of both Jews and Gentiles, he speaks simply of "works."

It has been noticed that the words, "to boast," "a boast," and "boasting," are characteristic of St. Paul, in whom such forms are found fifty-seven times. St. James has the verb twice, i. 9, iv. 16, and the verbal noun

once, iv. 16. And the author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* employs "a boast" once, iii. 6. But none of the forms are used by any other writer in the Greek Testament. In the Apostle to the Gentiles, distinguished among his fellows by imperial citizenship and Rabbinic training, by natural and supernatural gifts, by influence and success, the temptation to boast would frequently arise, and require human and Divine repression, *Phil.* iii. 7, *2 Cor.* xii. 7.

Then, to show the range and completeness of God's grace, and how utterly we owe all to Him, St. Paul adds,

**Eph. ii. 10. For we are His made-thing,
Created in Christ Jesus,**

**On [condition of] good works,
For which God made [us] ready beforehand,**

In order that we may walk in them.

The last line, like the last lines of *Isaiah* vii. 17, viii. 4, ix. 6, stands by itself without a parallel, and gains by that in emphasis.

The deliverance, St. Paul has said, is neither "out of you," nor "out of works." Now he explains that it could not be otherwise, for we are made, and even created by God. The first line presents the word for "His" as very emphatic, by placing it first.

Eph. ii. 10. For His [is] the made-thing [that] we are.

As the Apostle's theme has been, and is the supernatural life of the sanctified in union with the Christ, the making and the creating must refer to the new spiritual life in the Church, and not to the physical life in the world, as in

**Ps. c. 3. He—He made us,
And His we [are].**

Indeed, St. Paul made the distinction explicit five years ago, in the summer of 56, when he wrote,

2. Cor. v. 17. So that, if anyone [is] in Christ,
[There is] fresh creation.

Still earlier, indeed twelve years ago, in 49 A.D., he had written to the Galatian Churches of Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, saying,

Gal. vi. 15. For neither circumcision is anything ;
Nor uncircumcision ;
But fresh creation.

Then as God created matter, and force, and life, and human souls from nothing, and formed them into a world of wondrous beauty, so in the supernatural order, He created supernatural graces. By these, He elevates human souls to supernatural life, and moulds each one with as much care as if it was the sole object of His love. Therefore, there is a making as well as a creating. Our word, "poem," is now generally limited to the "thing made" by an artist in words ; but the Greek word, *poiēma*, originally meant a "thing made" by any artist or artisan. The word is not found elsewhere in the Greek Testament, except in *Rom.* i. 20, where it is used of "things made," the visible world, by which God's eternal power and divinity are intellectually apprehended. In the Greek Vulgate of

Is. xxix. 16. Or [will] the thing made [say] to him, who made it,
Thou didst not make me intelligently

The Greek word *poiēma* corresponds to the Hebrew *yētsēr*, a "thing formed," or framed, as earthenware. In the Greek Vulgate of *Ecclesiastes*, we meet the word frequently. There, for example, in viii. 9, 14, 17, it represents the Hebrew *ma'āśēh*, something made, or done. Then, in our

present passage, *Eph.* ii. 10, it means a manufactured article. We are completely God's work. He created the clays and the canvas; and He painted the picture.

But God, who created, and formed His sanctified people for His glory, did so with a condition involved, on certain terms. To express this, the Greek language, as in the present passage, employs the preposition *epi* with the dative case. So we read in

1. Thess. iv. 7. For God did not call us on [supposition of] uncleanness,

and in

Gal. v. 13. For you were called on [terms of] freedom.

Here, too, in *Eph.* ii. 10, the Apostle describes us as created and formed with a view to good works, these being inseparably connected with such an act. The *Book of Wisdom* also illustrates the construction in ii. 23, "God created man with a view to immortality." And the *Epistle to Diognetus*, possibly another Alexandrian work, written about 150 A.D., asks, vii. 3, if our Lord was sent with a view to despotism and fear and terror.

It is not "the good works," but "good works," of which St. Paul speaks. And attention to his actual words is still more necessary in the second line,

Eph. ii. 10d. For which God made [us] ready beforehand.

Some render it,

Which God prepared beforehand.

When we therefore ask them why the word for "which" is in the dative plural, meaning "for which things" or "persons," they say the relative "which" has been attracted from its accusative form to the dative of the pronoun "them" in the next line,

Eph. ii. 10e. In order that we may walk in them.

And when we further ask how good works can be prepared beforehand, St. Chrysostom compares the good works to a road. But in so doing, he misses the point, because he is substituting the course of the good works for the good works themselves. St. Augustine would explain the preparing beforehand as predetermining, predestinating. So doing, he too changes the figure, substituting an internal purpose for an external act.

But it is quite possible to interpret St. Paul's words without altering his figure of speech. In the *Epistle to the Romans*, written a little more than four years ago, in January, 57, we find the only other occasion, on which St. Paul used the verb "to prepare," or "make ready beforehand." He was then speaking of those vessels of mercy,

Rom. ix. 23. Which [God] prepared beforehand unto glory.

In the present passage, the true reference is the same, and to the vessels of mercy, the sanctified. Therefore, we have rendered the line,

Eph. ii. 10d. For which God made [us] ready beforehand.

And if it be asked, what suggests the word "us" as the implicit object, we point to the final line, which unquestionably means,

Eph. ii. 10e. In order that we may walk in them.

As "in them" corresponds to "for which" in the preceding line, so the pronoun "we" suggests the "us," implied there.

The last three lines, which connect our creation and formation in the supernatural order with a condition, are of great importance for determining the place of good

works in the process of justification. Such creation and formation are

Eph. ii. 10. On [condition of] good works,
For which [good works], God made us ready
beforehand,

In order that we may walk in them.

First of all, grace must be free, gratuitous, proceeding out of God's goodness, and not out of human works, as otherwise grace becomes no longer grace, *Rom.* xi. 6. As we have seen, certain dispositions, faith, fear, hope, initial love and penitence, are necessary before justification. These cannot be merited by works in the natural order, for there is no proportion between the natural work and the supernatural grace; and no one first gave to God, *Rom.* xi. 35.

Therefore, a grace to act supernaturally, an "actual grace," cannot be merited by any work in the natural order. But suppose a man co-operates with the actual graces, given to enable him to exercise supernatural faith, fear, hope, initial love and penitence, can he merit sanctifying grace? This is not merely a supernatural help in a supernatural action. It is the supernatural life to animate the natural man. It is the quality, which implies the soul's new mode of existence on a new and loftier plane. Men, seeking for illustrations in the natural order, have compared sanctifying grace to a bird's wings or a cup's contents. And even those comparisons are feeble beyond measure.

Now, it is clear that not even the supernatural actions of faith, fear, hope, initial love and penitence can deserve such sanctifying grace as a matter of justice, or *de condigno*, as the Schoolmen say. But we need to look more closely at the matter. In a man's justification and sanctification,

the making him just and holy, the constituting him a friend of God and a temple of the Holy Spirit, the end or final cause is his eternal life and especially the glory of God and of Christ. The efficient cause is the merciful God Himself. The formal cause is the justice, with which God makes us just. The instrumental cause is baptism, as the Sacrament of faith. And the meritorious cause is Jesus Christ our Lord, who merited our justification for us. Now we have found that such grace of justification and sanctification cannot be merited by the good works of faith, fear, hope, initial love and penitence, on the ground of *justice*, or *ex condigno*. When we have done all, we are only unnecessary bondmen, *Luke xvii. 10*. But what we could not claim on the score of justice, may be given as a reward through the generosity of God, that is, on the ground of His own *liberality*, or *de congruo*, to use the language of the Schoolmen. And if God, out of His own generosity, has promised it as a reward, we can merit it in virtue of His *liberality* and His *promise*, that is, *ex congruo infallibili*.

But can we merit increase of sanctifying grace and even predestination to glory by good works, that is, by works done through God's grace and in a state of sanctifying grace? On the ground of strict justice, we cannot. But He, who merited such graces for us, foretold His welcome of the blessed for good works, done to Him in the persons of the hungry, thirsty, homeless, naked, sick and imprisoned, *Matt. xxv. 34-40*. So we depend for such a reward on the liberality, promise and merit of our Lord, that is, *ex congruo infallibili*.

As St. Paul implies in the very passage, which we are considering, the creation and formation of a man in the supernatural order is gratuitous, but conditional. As that predestination to grace and glory is conditional, there is nothing capricious in God's decree, predestinating any

persons. For His foreknowledge of their good works shews it is not an arbitrary decree. At the same time, the fact of its being a decree shews that the process is not merely foreknown to God, but depends on His Will. And the requirement of good works vindicates His Holiness. So good works, proceeding from grace and motivated by faith, can in the case of a faithful Christian on earth, merit an eternal reward on the ground of justice, or *de condigno*. Therefore, St. Paul could point to his own crown of justice, which the just judge would repay him, 2 *Tim.* iv. 8. Yet our share in those good works is only the submission of our own will to God ;

Phil. ii. 13. For it is God,
Who is active in you,

As to both the being willing and the being active
On behalf of the [Divine] purpose.

Eph. ii. 11, 12. The Old Testament Dispensation.

Again, for a moment, in the pulsing of the Apostle's thought and emotion, the vehemence and intensity of the speech decline, while he describes the position of the Gentiles with regard to the Messianic Kingdom of the Old Testament Dispensation. Then, he will describe the Messianic peace, far other than that, which the current Messianism expected. And afterwards, he will pass within the kingdom of peace to the New Jerusalem, and gaze upon the Eternal City and Temple of peace.

We are using the word "Gentiles" instead of the word "nations." So we use the word "Christ" instead of the word "Anointed." Yet the Hebraic "Messiah" would often serve better than the Greek form *Christós*, because it would suggest that world of prophetic and apocalyptic thought and imagery, which was then associated in Jewish

minds with the Hebrew *Māshîāch* and the Aramaic *M'shîchā'*. The word "Gentiles" is sometimes useful to render the Hebrew *hag-gôyîm*, and the Greek *tà éthnē*. "the nations," as it suggests that scorn and hostility, with which Jews so often regarded those, who were not of Israel.

It would be a mistake, however, to use the word "Gentiles" for "nations" in the present verse; because St. Paul is addressing those outside Israel; and neither Pauline tact nor Pauline courtesy would permit the Apostle of the Gentiles to speak contemptuously of his audience. On the contrary, even while he is asserting the privileges of Israel, he somewhat slights those, who slight the Gentiles. But besides the explicit exclusion of the nations, and the explicit privileges of the nation, there is to be noted an implicit doctrine of continuity between the kingdom of Israel and the kingdom of the Messiah or Christ. This indeed was the basis of Old Testament prophecy, Ezekiel giving even the name of David to the Messiah, *Ezek.* xxxiv. 23, 24, xxxvii. 24, 25.

Having drawn the attention of his readers to the wealth of God's grace, St. Paul would shew its fulness the more by a reference to the position, in which it had found them. For this reason, he commences with *dio*, that is, *dià ho*, "on account of which," "wherefore." And he proceeds, inserting a parenthesis and breaking off his sentence.

**Eph. ii. II. Wherefore, be remembering that sometime,
you,
The nations in flesh—**

**(Those who are being called Uncircumcision
By that which is being called Circumcision,**

**In flesh,
Handmade)—**

As the phrase, "the Circumcision in flesh," is opposed to the expression, "the nations in flesh," we must understand the word "flesh" in both as the literal flesh. It is then a contrast between Gentiles and Jews, though after Alexander's conquests, the word, *éthnē*, "nations," became a political term to distinguish the native peoples from the Greek colonists, planted among them. This usage is illustrated by Polybius, vii. 9, who lived about 206-124 B.C. The word served the Septuagint translators, when they came, in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, 284-247 B.C., to render the word, *gôyim*, "nations," in the Mosaic Law, and wished to retain the unhappy associations of that word. So the Greek word, *éthnē*, "nations," played its part in distinguishing barbarians from Greeks, and both barbarians and Greeks from Israel. Now a new era commences. In it, such distinctions are found to have lost their value,

2. Cor. v 16. So that we—from now—
Know none according to flesh.

Further, the adjective "handmade," implies a contrast between circumcision by a physical rite, and that which is of the heart. The former might co-exist with an uncircumcised heart, *Lev.* xxvi. 41, *Jer.* ix. 26, *Ezek.* xlv. 7, and be merely "concision," *Phil.* iii. 2. The latter might be true circumcision, though "unhandmade," *Col.* ii. 11, and not according to the letter of the law, *Rom.* ii. 29.

The Apostle does not here deal with the relative value of Uncircumcision and Circumcision in flesh. No doubt, circumcision was necessary for position in the Israelite commonwealth, *Gen.* xvii. 14. By it, the circumcised person was admitted to a covenant and friendship with God; and his original sin was removed by God's grace. What was the relation between the rite and the grace in the case of children has been explained in various interesting ways by

various theologians. In the case of adults, the sacrament awoke dispositions of faith, love, hope and penitence. These dispositions, constituting the circumcision of the heart, were the means of grace. The Jew, however, like the Gentile, has been found dead "in view of" lapses. Even though he had been vivified by circumcision, yet, when he came to the age of reason, and became capable of deliberate and grievous sin, he died, *Rom. vii. 9.* So Jews and Gentiles, whether by sin of act or by sin of origin, need the vivifying grace of God.

In resuming his broken sentence, the Apostle does not repeat the words, "Wherefore, be remembering." But we may insert them to indicate the construction of language and argument.

Eph. ii. 12. [Wherefore, be remembering] that you were
at that season

Apart from Christ,

Having been estranged from the common-
wealth of Israel,

And [being] foreigners from the covenants of
the Promise,

Not having hope,

And godless in the world.

The Apostle resumes with the words, "that you were at that season," these evidently referring to the words, with which he had commenced,

Eph. ii. 11. Wherefore, be remembering that sometime, you.

He had then described the Gentiles as "the nations in the flesh," that is, not merely by natural descent, but in regard to the supernatural life, which is found in union with the

Christ. He now describes them as "apart from Christ," or "Messiah," This phrase, and the phrase, "in the world," which concludes the sentence, form a contrast to the frequent phrase, "in the Christ." And here, it is not "the Christ," but "Christ," the absence of the article making a proper name of the title, so that more emphasis is laid on the Person than on the Office.

St. Paul, having so described the relation of the Gentiles to Messiah or Christ, adds two parallel lines to describe their relation to the Messianic people :

Eph. ii. 12c. Having been estranged from the commonwealth
of Israel,
And [being] foreigners from the covenants of the
Promise.

"Having been estranged" is answered by "foreigners," and "the polity" or "commonwealth of Israel" is paralleled by "the covenants of the Promise." Therefore, "having been estranged" does not necessarily in this place imply an original union of Gentiles and Israelites. The word will be used again of Gentiles, as

Eph. iv. 18b. Having been estranged from the life of God ;

and it has already been employed in connection with converted Gentiles, as "having been estranged and enemies in the mind," *Col. i. 21*.

The corresponding word, *xénoi*, rendered "foreigners," is a technical term. In Aristotle's *Politics*, III. ii., they are distinguished not only from the citizens and the slaves, but also from the *métoikoi*, "or settlers," who were allowed to live in Athens on paying a tax, but without the rights of citizens. So both the word "estranged" and the word "foreigners" must be understood in the sense of "aliens."

The plural in the phrase, "the covenants of the Promise,"

is explained by the renewals of the Covenant. And that Covenant, in which the Messiah or Christ was promised, was indeed implied in the creation of Man to be head of the world, *Gen.* i. 26. For such a purpose involved the appearing of a mightier Adam to rule a larger realm, than the first Adam possessed in Eden. The Covenant was renewed in spite of the Fall, *Gen.* iii. 15. It was connected with the descendents of Shem in the line,

Gen. ix. 27. And He [God] will dwell in the tents of Shem.

No doubt, the translation of that line has been much debated; but the rendering, which we have given, seems most consonant with the language, the parallelism and the context. The Covenant is then limited to Abraham's sons, *Gen.* xvii. 7. By the exclusion of Esau, it becomes a Covenant with the sons of Jacob or Israel. Since that Covenant involved both spiritual and temporal elements, the commonwealth of Israel, in spite of national apostasies and national penalties, implied an external order and constitution in this world, as well as an invisible order of supernatural grace. It was both a visible and an invisible kingdom.

That kingdom is described by St. Paul as a *politeía*, "a polity," or "commonwealth." The word is not used elsewhere in the Greek Testament, except by St. Luke, who is now present, and has the diary or notes, from which he will draw the "we-sections" in the *Acts of the Apostles*, xvi. 10-17, xx. 5-xxi. 18, xxvii. 1-xxviii. 16. There the word, *politeía*, is found in the statement, made by the tribune, Claudius Lysias, to St. Paul,

Acts xxii. 28. I—I acquired this *politeía* [or citizenship] at a great sum.

And though the word does not occur in one of the formal

“we-sections,” there is every probability that the passage in which it appears, belongs to the same diary or notes.

The word is used for commonwealth and for citizenship. It suggests both a Greek city as a little state and the membership of such a city. Aristotle, in his *Politics*, III. vi. 1, treats the *politeia* as the ordering of a city both generally in respect of rulerships, and especially in respect of sovereignty. In his *Politics*, VI. viii., he also treats a *politeia* as a moderate and harmonious combination of oligarchy and democracy. More than royalty or aristocracy, it would appeal to the Greek mind. It would not do so the less, because its corruption only implied democracy, while that of royalty was despotism, and that of aristocracy, oligarchy.

Politeia was therefore the most favourable word, by which St. Paul could speak of the Israelite kingdom to Hellene or Hellenist ears. Had he been writing for Jews, “the kingdom of God” would have served for a perfect title. And had Josephus, who is now living in Jerusalem, already written the work, which he will publish *against Apion* about 95 A.D., St. Paul would have had the word “theocracy” ready to hand. For, coining that word, Josephus will write, ii. 16, “Some entrusted the governmental authority to monarchies, some to the lordships of a few men, and others to the multitudes. But our legislator looked off to none at all of these ; but, as one might say in a forced form of speech, he appointed the government to be a theocracy, and attributed the rule and the power to God.”

Having indicated the Gentile position as regards the Messiah and the Messianic people in Old Testament times, St. Paul takes a wider view ; and looking at them in the setting of the whole scene, he describes them as

Eph. ii. 12e. Not having hope,
And godless in the world.

The word for "not," *mē*, implies that they were conscious of their hopelessness. They had not the corporate hope, which Messianic prophecy nourished in the heart of the Jew. Indeed, it has long been a commonplace that Israel alone had its Golden Age in the future. And for the individual, the Gentile outlook was pessimist, as expressed by some of their noblest minds. Not to dwell on the despair, now growing in the heathen world around St. Paul, or on the increasing number of suicides, we may take the utterance of him, who was the most consummate master of artistic expression in the pagan world. In his *Œdipus Colónéus*, 1225, 1226, Sophocles causes the Chorus to chant,

Not to have been born is the best account of all ; but when one
has appeared on earth,
Much the second best is to go as quickly as possible to the place,
whence indeed he has come.

It may be objected that the words are those of a poet ; and that Greek poetry is inevitably sad, for its highest aims are attained in tragedy. The point is worth consideration. But tragedy, when we regard it in its full scope, and in its relation to life, does more than refine the emotions of pity and fear, and more than relieve the soul by affording an outlet for such emotions, for it interprets the inmost meaning of human life as the persistent action of self-sacrifice. And self-sacrifice is not an expression of despair. Therefore we must look elsewhere than to tragedy for the pessimism of Sophocles.

Besides, we can take the speech of Pericles, preserved in substance by Thucydides, and find what there was of hope for the Greek in the hour of calamity. The winter of 431 B.C. was approaching, when Pericles, in the Ceramicus street through the ágora, or market-place of Athens, pronounced the funeral oration over those, who had fallen

in that, the first year of the Peloponnesian War. And all he could urge to comfort widows, orphans and bereaved parents lay in their past happiness, the shortness of life, the fame of the dead, and the children to come. Well, therefore, could St. Paul forbid the Thessalonians to sorrow "as the rest, who have not hope," 1 *Thess.* iv. 13.

For a moment, it may seem an exaggeration in St. Paul, that he adds godlessness to hopelessness. Now the plural word, *átheoi*, used here, is not found elsewhere in the Greek Bible. So we must look for its meaning in pagan writers; and there we find it used in respect of intellect, of will and of action. The *átheos* in intellect disbelieves in God, and is an atheist, Plato's *Apology*, 26 C. The *átheos* in will is godless and impious, Plato's *Laws*, p. 966 E. The *átheos* in action is without God, that is, without God's help, as Sophocles, in *Œdipus, the Tyrant*, 661, 662, gives the Chorus to say,

. . . . godless, friendless, whatever be worst—
Would I might so perish, if I have this thought.

These references suggest that *Rom.* i. 20-23, may be found St. Paul's paraphrase of the word *átheoi*. He is not referring to the men, who rose above their time and place as witnesses for God, but to the mass of the Gentiles in their idolatry. Nor was it an idolatry, in which the intellect alone was engaged, *Rom.* i. 28. It included also the perverting of the will in the adoration of creatures instead of the Creator, *Rom.* i. 23, and the forfeiture of God's help, *Rom.* i. 24. It was atheist, godless and God-forsaken.

So the Gentiles were godless,

Eph. ii. 12f. And godless in the world,

in the visible and transient order, in which they were immersed. This Pauline phrase, "in the world," suggests

to us by contrast the Johannine, "out of the world," *John* viii. 23, xv. 19, xviii. 36.

The word *átheoi* became the popular description of Christians. As we learn from the letter of the Smyrnæan Christians *on the Martyrdom of Polycarp*, ix., the proconsul, on Saturday, February 23, 155, required that bishop not only to swear by "the Fortune of Caesar," so taking part in the worship of the Emperor, but also to say "Away with the *átheoi*," so disowning his Christian brethren. But St. Polycarp, waving his hand towards the Gentile crowd in the race-course, cried, "Away with the *átheoi*." St. Justin Martyr, in his *Second Apology*, x., which he presented to the Roman Emperor and Senate in 160 A.D., pointed out that Socrates had been accused of the same crime, because he did not regard the gods, recognised by the state, as gods at all. And he, ii, mentions the Cynic Crescens as seeking favour with the mob by charging the Christians with being atheists and impious.

Eph. ii. 13-18. The New Dispensation

St. Paul, writing to those who had been apart from Christ, *Eph.* ii. 12, but were now in Christ Jesus, *Eph.* ii. 13, leaves the past, *Eph.* ii. 11, 12, for the present, *Eph.* ii. 13-18, as he will presently leave the present for the future, *Eph.* ii. 19-22. He has just dealt with the Messianic Kingdom, and before proceeding to the Messianic City, he will deal with the Messianic Peace, just as an imperial writer might place an account of the *Pax Romana*, the "Roman Peace" of the Augustan era, between a description of the Roman Empire and one of Rome. Nor is the comparison fanciful, for the Pauline outlook was imperial. And it was the Pauline aim to convert that Empire, the rival of the Church as a universal and cosmopolitan organisation. He himself was a freeman of the Empire. He and his companion, St.

Luke, prefer the Roman names of districts. And his eyes had long been turned toward the Imperial Centre, for even at Ephesus, in the autumn of 55 A.D., when he was planning his journey to Macedonia, Achaia and Jerusalem, he said, "After I have been there, I must also see Rome," *Acts* xix. 21. Then, in his epistles, there is something of the Imperial tone ; and this encyclical suggests the Imperial rescript, which defined law or policy for a proconsul.

To the Apostle, as to every student of the Old Testament, the Messianic kingdom implied an era of peace. The covenant of Jehovah with His people included a promise of peace in the land, *Lev.* xxvi. 6 ; and His covenant with His priests was definitely His covenant of peace, *Num.* xxv, 12. It is one of the key-words in *Isaiah*. When Messiah will be born, He will be named

Is. ix. 5. Prince of Peace.

And in that day,

Is. ix. 6. To the multiplication of the principedom
And to peace—there is no end.

So wrote the prophet in 734 B.C. ; and writing soon after 698 B.C., he will describe the herald of that kingdom as one,

Is. lii. 7. Announcing peace.

Then the peace of Jerusalem's sons will be great, *Is.* liv. 13. They will be led with peace, *Is.* lv. 12. The oversight of them will be peace ; and Jehovah will turn peace to Jerusalem like a river, *Is.* lxvi. 12.

Isaiah's contemporary, Micah, tells how the Messianic ruler from Bethlehem will be Israel's peace in the days of hostile invasion, typified by the Assyrian, *Mic.* v. 5. And Nahum, prophesying soon after the Assyrian sack of

Egyptian Thebes in 663 B.C., quotes Isaiah's prediction of the herald,

Nah. i. 15. Announcing peace.

Afterwards, Jeremiah, in 586 B.C., on the eve of Jerusalem's Fall and of the Babylonian Captivity, foretold the Return and God's revelation of abundant peace and truth to the restored exiles, *Jer.* xxxiii. 6. Then, in the next year, 585 B.C., according to the better reading in *Ezek.* xxxiii. 21, and on the evening before a fugitive reached the exiles in Babylon with the news of the Fall, Ezekiel predicted the Davidic kingdom of Messiah and Jehovah's covenant of peace, *Ezek.* xxxiv. 24, 25. And this, he repeated later in 572 B.C., *Ezek.* xxxvii. 24-28. The Psalms also are rich in the theme, xxix. 11, xxxvii. 11, lxxii. 3, 7, and cxxii. 7, serving as examples. And if Haggai, ii. 9, in the seventh month of 520 B.C., foretells the peace to be given in the Temple, Zechariah, ix. 10, sometime after the ninth month of 518 B.C., actually predicts the day, when Jehovah, in universal dominion, will speak peace to the nations.

Between Malachi's reference, about 432 B.C., to the Levitical covenant of life and peace, *Mal.* ii. 5, and the Angels' Song in 8 B.C., announcing peace on earth to men, with whom God is well-pleased, *Luke* ii. 14, the world craved for peace. About 180 B.C., the son of Sirach chanted,

Sirach 1. 23. He will give you wisdom of heart ;
And it will be in peace between you.

So the words run in the Hebrew text, which was the original form, unless Margoliouth's objections prevail. In any case, the Greek Vulgate presents the thought in this fashion,

May He give us gladness of heart,
And that peace may be in our days.

A little after 170 B.C., the *Book of Enoch*, x. 17, described the happiness of the just in the Messianic period, and said,

And all the days of their youth
And of their old age will be finished in peace.

Then, between 109 and 105 B.C., the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, "Levi," xviii. 4, told of Hebrew hope in the days of John Hyrcanus, saying among other things,

And there will be peace in all the earth.

The same work, in the "Testament of Judah," xxiv. 1, predicted,

And after these things will rise the Star of Peace.

After the death of John Hyrcanus in 105 B.C., and before Pompey's entry into Jerusalem in 63 B.C., an orthodox Jew of Palestine, in the *First Book of Maccabees*, applied the Messianic language to the state of the Jews under Simon Thassi, that is, Simon "the zealous," between 143 and 135 B.C., commencing

1 Macc. xiv. 8. And they were cultivating their land in peace,
and adding of Simon,

1 Macc. xiv. 11. He made peace on the land.

To these passages, we may add Vergil's prediction in 40 B.C., of a boy, who would be born to Augustus, and rule a world at peace. It is true, that the *Fourth Eclogue* was belied early in the following year, 39, when Scribonia bore the hapless Julia, and was divorced the self-same day. None the less, the Vergilian verse expressed the world's desire.

It is now a century since Vergil wrote his Eclogue. And

St. Paul, turning away from Boadicea's revolt in Britain, from the terror of a Parthian invasion, and from the premonitory symptoms of the Jewish rebellion, looks over the world, and sees the Messianic peace, realised in the supernatural order. It is a peace, full of significance for nineteen centuries and those to follow. If we might employ Hegelian speech, we should say, that it is a peace, which solves the antithesis of Jew and Gentile in the synthesis of the Catholic Church. Or, if we prefer the imagery of St. Chrysostom, we may symbolise it by a golden statue, that has been produced by melting one of silver with one of lead.

St. Paul would proclaim this peace; and the Isaian words are ready for his lips.

Is. lvii. 19. Peace, peace to the far
And to the near.

But the Apostle, concentrating thoughts and images into one sentence, declares this proclamation is valid now, not only for the Jews, who were near, but for the Gentiles also, who were far. The peace was made by one definite act. It is found "in Christ Jesus" and "in the Blood of the Christ," *Eph.* ii. 13.

The former phrase clearly means in vital union with Israel's Messiah and Man's Deliverer. The latter phrase does not mean simply "by means of Christ's Blood." The preposition is *en*, "in," not *diá* with the genitive, "by means of," as when St. Paul spoke of the Beloved,

Eph. i. 7. In whom we have the redemption
By means of His Blood.

But the Apostle is referring to a new covenant. Now, covenants were ratified in sacrificial blood, *Heb.* ix. 18, 22. So the covenant of Mount Sinai was confirmed in oxen's blood, *Exod.* xxiv. 8, *Heb.* ix. 20, which Moses named the

"Blood of the Covenant." And so the covenant of Mount Zion was established in a Victim's Blood, which the Victim Himself named His "Blood of the Covenant," *Mark* xiv. 24.

The words "near" and "far" were understood by the Jews of relation to the Covenant. And indeed, they became technical terms. So the Talmud tells how a sinful woman wished to become a proselyte, and went to Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrkanos, brother-in-law of Gamaliel II., and head of a Rabbinical college in Lydda, between 90 and 130 A.D. She said to him, "Rabbi, make me near." On his refusal, she was received by Rabbi Joshua ben Chananya, whose disciple said, "Rabbi Eliezer removed her, but thou art making her near."

The balance of the expressions in this verse, *Eph.* ii. 13, is seen more clearly, when the fourth line is shewn parallel to the first, and the third to the second, as in the introverted parallelism of Hebrew poetry, illustrated in *Is.* vi. 8, ix. 18c. 19, xi. 12, lix. 8, and *John*, i. 14,

Eph. ii. 13. But now, in Christ Jesus,
 You, who sometime were far,
 Became near
 In the Blood of the Christ.

The same arrangement will bring out the meaning of the next verse, *Eph.* ii. 14. The Peace-maker is He, who killed the enmity. The making both Gentiles and Jews one implies the undoing of the partition, the hedge between the two.

Eph. ii. 14. For our peace is He,
 Who made both the [systems] one,
 And undid the partition of the fence—
 The enmity—in His flesh.

We have rendered the first line,
 For our peace is He,
 instead of
 For He is our peace,

in order to make the word "peace" the subject, because it has the article in the Greek, and in order to make the word "He" as emphatic in the English, as it is in the Greek sentence, where it stands first. In the second line, the Greek words for "the both" and "one" are neuter. This gender is certainly used of persons both in Attic Greek, as in Xenophon's *Anabasis*, VII. iii. 11, and many times in the Common Dialect, as in 1 *Cor.* i. 27, 28, *Heb.* vii. 7, *Apoc.* iii. 2, and *John* vi. 37, 39, x. 29. But when the neuter is so used, the personality of the persons is not prominent, to say the least. And so, we have ventured to express the unexpressed noun by the word, "systems."

That second line,

Eph. ii. 14b. Who made both the [systems] one,

finds its parallel in the third line,

Eph. ii. 14c. And undid the partition of the fence,

which really repeats the idea in a fine and bold figure.

Although St. Paul was writing for Christians in Roman Asia, many of them, besides the converts from Judaism, would have some knowledge of the Temple, then standing in Jerusalem. Such persons would readily understand his reference to the partition, formed by the fence. The "partition of the fence" is not quite "the partition, which fences," nor "the partition, which belongs to the fence," but the "partition," the *meso-toichon*, the "middle-wall," or "partition-wall, which consists in the fence." The genitive is one of apposition. We may therefore render the phrase, "the partition, that is, the fence." So, in

Eph. vi. 14, we will explain "the breastplate of justice" as "the breastplate, consisting in justice."

Judaism was familiar with the idea of a fence. In the Isaian parable, *Is.* v. 5, Israel is represented as a Vineyard, protected by a [thorn-] hedge and a [stone-] fence. And the *Ethics of the Fathers* insisted not only on deliberation in judgment, and increase of students, but also on a fence for the Law. The Pharisees indeed tried to make such a fence by extending the area of prohibition, so as to lessen the danger of transgression. But the "fence," to which St. Paul refers, was that, raised to defend the Temple of Jerusalem from Gentile intrusion. He has reason to remember it. Four years ago, at Pentecost, which began on Saturday, May 28, in that year 57, his chain was imposed on him through the outcry of the Jews, who thought he had led a Gentile within the sacred boundary. Some Jews, who had come from Roman Asia to Jerusalem for the feast, had recognised the Ephesian Trophimus in his company. Afterwards, meeting St. Paul in the Temple, and knowing something of his doctrine and aims, they leaped to the conclusion, that he must have brought his friend into the Temple with him, *Acts* xxi. 29.

From his room here in Rome, the mind of St. Paul travels swiftly over the blue Mediterranean and the Judean hills to the one city on earth, that could suggest home to the scattered Jews. His memory can recall, and his imagination picture the great quadrangle. He sees its polished wall, $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile in length, and rising in alternate layers of white and veined marble. Here, fronting the east and Olivet, are cloisters and a portico, called Solomon's Porch, with remains of Solomon's Temple underneath and the golden eagle of Rome overhead. On the left, to the south, is Herod's Royal Cloister, built with 162 Corinthian pillars in four rows. These cloisters and the great Herodian wall

form the outer boundary of the outer court, into which Gentiles were admitted. But the place was never called the "Court of the Gentiles" by Josephus in the first century, or by the *Middoth*, or "Measurements" tract of the *Mishnah* in the second. Here mingle Syrians and Romans, Greeks and Jews; and here are Rabbis, seated among their pupils.

This great court extends 585 feet from east to west, and 610 feet from north to south. Within it stands a plateau or platform, about 22 feet high. On this, the Temple and its courts were built. Just in front, on the left hand, are shops for sacrificial animals and Temple money. Then round the whole platform to fence the holy courts and buildings from Gentile presence is the stone "breastwork" or "parapet," the *Sôvêg* or *Sôvâg*, the middle-wall or partition of the fence. It is four and a half feet high, with thirteen openings to admit Jews. And on this breastwork were "stones of warning," inscribed slabs to forbid a stranger from entering on pain of death. So Josephus, in the Greek text of his *Wars*, V. v. 2, written originally in Aramaic in 69 and 70 A.D., describes this partition. He says that its structure was very beautiful, and that upon it, at equal distances from one another, there stood pillars, declaring the law of purity. Some were in Greek, and some were in Roman letters, saying that "no foreigner should go within that sanctuary."

One such tablet was found by Clermont-Ganneau; and transliterating it, we find

METHENAALLOGENEEISPO
 REUESThAIENTOSTOUPÉ
 RITOIERONTRUPhAKTOUKAI
 PERIBOLOUOSDANLE
 PhThEEAUTOIAITIOSES
 TAIDIATOEXAKOLOU
 ThEINThANATON.

In literal English, this would mean,

[Let] no stranger enter
 within the area
 and the sacred-place barrier and
 enclosure. Whoever is taken
 there, to himself accountable he will
 be on account of the following
 death.

That is, of course, " Let no stranger enter within the barrier and enclosure around the sacred place. Whoever is taken will be accountable to himself for his death, which will follow." And it may be noticed in passing, that Josephus speaks of the " barrier " as the inscription does ; but he spells the Greek word correctly as *drûphaktos*, the inscription substituting *t* for the initial *d*.

We cannot realise what a Gentile's entrance would have meant to a Jew. Such a calamity was chief among the woes of Jerusalem, when she fell before Nebuchadnezzar in 586 B.C. ; and Jeremiah lamented,

Lam. i. 10. For she saw :
 Nations came to her Sanctuary.

[As to] which Thou didst command :
 They shall not come in[to] the congregation [that
 is] Thine.

Inside that *Sôrêg*, between it and the third wall of the Temple, was a raised terrace, fifteen feet wide, and called the *Hêl*, or more accurately, the *Chêyl*. So the name is applied in the Talmud, though *chêyil*, or *chêl*, the Aramaic *chayil*, means primarily, an army, and secondarily, a fortification. In spite of much that has been said, we must conclude that St. Paul's reference is not to the *Chêyl*, but to the *Sôrêg*, the balustrade or barrier, described by Josephus in his *Wars*, V. v. 2, of 69 A.D., and again in his

Antiquities, XV. xi. 5, of 93 A.D. It was the latter, which was prominent in the mind of a Jew, when he thought of the relation between the nations and the nation. And so Philo, the Alexandrian contemporary of St. Paul, writing of the embassy to Gaius Caligula in 39 A.D., and having told of that madman's desire to desecrate the Temple with the statue of himself as a god, adds, c. xxi, that death was inexorably pronounced on all, who entered the inner court, unless they were Jews by blood.

Although that *Sôrêg* and its inscriptions are standing at this moment, while St. Paul is dictating this encyclical, yet it has become ineffective and without significance for that supernatural order, which gives the natural order whatever it has of permanent value. The *Sôrêg* is undone. Had St. Paul meant the verb to be taken literally, he would probably have used a compound form of it, and said *katalúsas*, instead of *lúsas*. To translate it by "broken down" is to suggest a literal meaning. This is not necessarily implied in the Greek *lúein*, to loose, dissolve, undo, break up, or break down. Neither is it involved in the Aramaic word, *sh'rā'*, which apparently underlies the Greek verb here, and in our Lord's words, when He spoke of His own Body to the Jews, saying,

John ii. 19. Undo this Sanctuary,
And I will raise it in three days.

The fourth line of the verse,

Eph. ii. 14d. The enmity—in His flesh,

has been much discussed. The Greek text gives us only "the enmity" in the accusative, followed by "in His flesh." Is the word for "enmity" in the accusative because of the previous "undid," "the enmity" being in apposition to "the partition" and explanatory of it? That would

indeed be quite correct in form, as Greek writers speak of "undoing enmity." And though the partition was not the enmity, it was the symbol of it. So the construction would unfold the meaning of the *Sôrêg*. Further, it was "in His Flesh," this phrase being a condensed form of the expression in the *Epistle to the Colossians*,

Col. i. 22. In the body of His flesh by means of death.

For the death of the Messiah closed the old order, and rent the Temple veil, *Matt.* xxvii. 51. The new order flows from His Resurrection Life. Finally, if we compare the first line of the verse,

Eph. ii. 14a. For our peace is He,
with this, the fourth line,

The enmity—in His flesh,

we see "the enmity" corresponds to "our peace;" and "He" is answered by "His flesh," in which our Lord undid the spiritual partition and enmity, *Eph.* ii. 14, and made peace "by means of the blood of His cross," *Col.* i. 20.

Other solutions are offered. Some would explain the accusative form of "enmity" by the verb, "rendered futile," which belongs to the next clause, and tells how our Lord rendered the servile law futile. Then "the law" would be in apposition to "the enmity," although the phrase "in His flesh" came between. The suggestion, therefore, compels the verb to an uncomfortable relation with "enmity," and strains the privilege of apposition.

A more ingenious and more tempting solution bids us note that St. Paul will use the expression,

Eph. ii. 16d. When he killed the enmity—in Himself.

It is urged that St. Paul, at the present moment, is about to

write those words, but omits "when He killed," and substitutes "in His flesh" for "in Himself." Then, it is added, St. Paul goes off at a word, according to his characteristic habit. Unfortunately for the suggestion, excellent and interesting as it is, St. Paul begins the first expression with "the enmity," and the second with "when He killed." Had he begun the second also with "the enmity," then we might have supposed that he was resuming his speech, having broken away in the first case after dictating the word. Besides, there is no real "going off at a word," for "the enmity" is followed by "in His flesh," and that by the annulment of the servile law, and that again, by the creation of one new man out of the two men, the Jew and the Gentile.

It is therefore much the best to adopt the simplest rendering :

Eph. ii. 14. For our peace is He,
 Who made both the [systems] one,
 And undid the partition, formed by the fence—
 The enmity—in His flesh.

The act and the time of the act, by which the unity was accomplished and the partition undone, are given in the next statement. This will tell how our Lord rendered futile, inoperative, the law of the commandments, expressed in decrees. Had St. Paul dictated the sentence in this order,

When He rendered futile the Law
 Of the commandments in decrees,

we had seen how the phrases "of the commandments in decrees" define what law was rendered futile. The annulling was not indeed by repeal, but by a transcending, as a child's interests by a man's work, 1 Cor. xiii. 11. So the Pentateuchal legislation, here representing the principle of law, is transcended by the faith, which establishes law,

Rom. iii. 31, and by the love, which is the fulness of law, *Rom.* xiii. 10. Both these transcending principles are made one in the faith, which is active by means of love, *Gal.* v. 6. But St. Paul follows a different order. So he brings "the law of the commandments" closer to "the partition," "the fence" and "the enmity"; and the verb, "He rendered futile," will be brought into conjunction with the verb, "He might create," which will open the succeeding couplet. Therefore, the Apostle commences with the accusative; and we may retain his order by rendering the lines,

Eph. ii. 15a. [As to] the law of the commandments—
In decrees—when He rendered [it] futile.

And so that which made the law servile, its form as decrees, stands out emphatically.

But we need look more closely at the description of the law. As "the partition of the fence" meant "the partition, formed by the fence," so "the law of the commandments" means "the law, formed by the commandments." It is then the Mosaic Law. But there has been some question whether it meant the ritual law alone, or both the ritual and the moral law. There is no ground in the words themselves for a decision; so we must take the whole expression, and go deeper into the matter. As the phrase, "in decrees," is emphatic, we may begin by examining the meaning of the word *dogma*, rendered "decree." We must not give it the sense of "doctrine," though it had that meaning in the philosophical schools, Cicero's *Academics*, ii. 9, Seneca's *Epistles*, xcv. 10, and retained it in Christian writers, St. Ignatius to the *Magnesians*, xiii, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, i., St. Justin Martyr's *First Apology*, vii. In the Greek Testament, it is used of the Emperor's edicts, *Luke* ii. 1, *Acts* xvii. 7, and of the Apostolic decrees, issued by the

Synod of Jerusalem in the spring of 49 A.D., *Acts* xvi. 4. It is to be noted that these three examples are found in the writings of one, who has been St. Paul's devoted companion, and now stands near him as he dictates. The other instances are Pauline. There is this in the present passage, *Eph.* ii. 15, and that, but recently written in

Col. ii. 14. Having erased our adverse "note of hand"
with respect to decrees—
Which was antagonistic to us—

And He [the Christ] has taken it away out
of the midst,
When He nailed it to the Cross.

It is then the form and the principle of the law, which are transcended by a new form and a new principle. So our passage will be paralleled forty years hence by a student of this encyclical, when he will write in his Gospel,

John i. 16. Because we all received out of His Fulness ;
And [we received] grace instead of grace.

Because the Law was given by means of Moses :
Grace and Truth became by means of Jesus Christ.

Here is clearly stated the difference between the old order and the new, between the Law and the Gospel. In the former case, the mediator was Moses ; and as the *Ethics of the Fathers*, iv. 5, taught, the reward of a precept was a precept, that is, he who obeyed one precept received another as a reward. In the latter, the mediator is the Messiah, God Incarnate ; and there is grace instead of grace, another and greater grace being given as a reward for the accepting of a grace.

It is not as if the life of grace had a lower ideal of right and goodness than that in the life of law, *Matt.* v. 19. As a matter of fact, it can have, and has a higher, because it

enables a man to attain a higher. If the ritual law is transcended, and the typical rites have passed away, because the antitypes have come, they have not passed away as vain, but are at once lost and preserved in their fulfilment. As to the moral law, it has not been repealed in such a way that now killing is no murder. In this particular case, for example, it penetrates to the inmost springs of action, and treats the sin as a manifestation of an interior principle, and as one expression of forbidden hatred, *Matt.* v. 22. So the special regulations, which fenced the Jews from the other nations, as, for example, the circumcision, which marked them off from the Greeks and Barbarians, enter upon their third stage. Hygienic in their physical effect, they became indicative of a covenant relation with God. So He had taken the natural rainbow, and made it a sign of His covenant, *Gen.* ix. 13. But now the covenant relation is expressed by faith, hope, love, sacrifice and sacraments, all being of the Messianic or Christian order. For now, the Covenant has overleaped the limits of Palestine and the Jewish measure of blessing.

This removal of the distinction between Jew and Gentile is not made by sharing the characteristic qualities of both, but by raising those qualities to a supernatural life, in which they are enlarged, enriched and transformed. Stoicism made men equal in poverty ; but Christianity in wealth. Sin indeed levels Jew and Gentile in death ; but grace in supernatural life. But the undoing of the enmity and the rendering separatist regulations futile are necessary to the passage from the lower to the higher level. And our Lord, the Messiah, accomplished this,

**Eph. ii. 15c. In order that He may create the two [men]
in Himself**

Into one fresh Man, making peace.

Now St. Paul uses the masculine plural, because he is no longer imaging Judaism and heathendom as two systems, but as two men. He describes the act as one of creation, *Eph.* ii. 10, iv. 24. For the giving of supernatural life to a soul, that has only natural life, is as much an act of creation as the first production of the material universe and the cosmic force, or the first origination of natural life and the first communication of existence to a human soul. The new creation is in the supernatural order. And the sanctified souls are in mystical and real communion and union with the Christ. Therefore, St. Paul adds the phrase, "in Himself."

The second line corresponds to the first. The phrase, "into one fresh man," answers to "in order that He may create the two [men]." And "making peace" is parallel to "in Himself," that is, in union with Himself. We use the word "fresh" to render the adjective *kainós*. In *Col.* iii. 10, also, St. Paul had spoken of the new man; but there he used the word *néos*. If we may apply Trench's distinction, *Synonyms*, § lx., to the words, we may say that the Colossian reference was only to time, the supernatural manhood being regarded as young, recent and not ancient. But the Ephesian reference includes both time and quality. the supernatural manhood being viewed as fresh, different from what has gone before and not aged. So the Apostle describes the union of Jew and Gentile in the Christ under the figure of two men, who become a third, different from either of the two, and therefore neither Jew nor Gentile.

The final words, "making peace," not only repeat the opening words of

Eph. ii. 14. For our peace is He,

but they also suggest the theme for the next verses, which indeed speak of the peace between Jew and Gentile, but

more explicitly of that between them both and God. Therefore St. Paul continues,

Eph. ii. 16. And [in order that] He may reconcile both
the [men]
In one body to God
By means of the Cross,
When He killed the enmity [by their union]
in Himself—

Now the two men, the Jew and the Gentile, are made one body, and reconciled to God by means of Messiah's death. For Messiah, in dying, closed the old order, and opened the new, in which both Jew and Gentile may enter into mystical union with Him. United in Him, their enmity is dead, killed by Messiah in His death.

But it will make the passage clearer, if we compare it with the parallel passage, which St. Paul has just written to the Colossians,

Col. i. 19. Because in Him [the Messiah], [God] was well-pleased
That all the Fulness should dwell ;

20. And by means of Him [the Messiah], to reconcile
All the things unto Himself [God]—

When He [Messiah] made peace
By means of the blood of His Cross—

[To reconcile] by means of Him—whether the things
on the earth
Or the things in the heavens—

21. And [to reconcile] you—being sometime estranged
And hostile with respect to the mind,

In the works,
The evil [works]—

But now [in the new dispensation] He reconciled [you]

22. In the body of His flesh by means of [His] death.

It is only in these two passages, the word "reconcile" is compounded with the preposition *apo-*. Abbott, indeed, in his *Commentary on the Ephesians*, p. 66, regards the prefix as only intensifying the verb. But Lightfoot, in his *Commentary on the Galatians*, p. 160, suggests that it implies not only the making of peace, but also restitution to a state, lost or potential or destined; and he justifies his view by a reference to Tertullian's argument *against Marcion*, V. xix., and to St. Augustine's comment on the same prefix in *Gal.* iv. 5.

With regard to the "one body" in *Eph.* ii. 16, we can hardly identify it with the "body of His flesh" in *Col.* i. 22, because the figures are different. The former is parallel to the "One Spirit," *Eph.* ii. 18, iv. 4. And the latter is presented in *Eph.* ii. 15, in the condensed form, "in His flesh." The "one body" describes the corporate life, into which Jew and Gentile enter. It is hardly a complete expression of the Catholic Church, for this Epistle at least explicitly includes the Headship of the Christ and the Spiritual Life of the Holy Spirit in such a figure. However, the phrase, "by means of His cross" finds its counterparts in the Colossian phrases "by means of the blood of His Cross," *Col.* i. 20, and "by means of His death," *Col.* i. 22.

But the phrase, which we have rendered "in Himself," has been variously interpreted. Tertullian, writing *against Marcion*, V. 17, about 208 A.D., explains it as "in it," and refers it to the "one body." St. Jerome, vii. 581, also translates the words as "in it," but refers the expression to "the Cross." Yet St. Jerome, three years earlier, in 385, did not alter the Old Latin version, which read "in Himself," but preserved it in his Latin Vulgate. That it was the rendering in the Old Latin, St. Jerome himself acknowledges, vii. 581. Certainly, it is found in the Old

Latin versions in the Claromontanus d, of Cent. vi., its copy, the Sangerman e, of Cent. ix., and the twins, the Augien f and the Boernerian g, of Cent. ix. It was the translation in the Latin version used by Victorinus at Rome about 360, by St. Ambrose in 387 at Milan, as he quotes the phrase in his work *on Abraham*, ii. 6, and by St. Augustine at Hippo about 400, when he wrote *Against Faustus*, xxii. The same explanation of the phrase is given by the Gothic version, which may owe it to the influence of the Latin, and by the Armenian version, which may in this as in other cases represent the Old Syriac. To these testimonies, we must add the fact that the same phrase in the preceding verse, *Eph.* ii. 15, certainly means "in Himself"; and there is the strong probability that it stands on both occasions for the Pauline phrase "in Christ."

So the Apostle tells how the Christ made peace. And immediately, he relates how the Christ has announced the peace, which He made. Naturally, this is expressed in the language of the Old Testament, and in the imagery of Messianic prophecy. We have seen in *Eph.* ii. 13, how the Isaian words,

Is. lvii. 19. Peace, peace to the far
And to the near,

form the theme, the "Wagnerian phrase," the homiletic text, for this magnificent passage, *Eph.* ii. 13-18. So the section opened; and now as it closes, St. Paul repeats his text, prefixing another Isaian theme. In the Hebrew prophet, it refers to Messiah's herald,

Is. lii. 7. How beautiful on the mountains
The feet of him, who reports good tidings,
Announcing peace!

But St. Paul applies this to the Messiah Himself. And he could well do so, as the Messiah was the supreme herald of the peace, and could also be described as doing what His own heralds did, according to the Augustinian aphorism, "What one does through another, he does through himself." So the verse runs in briefest lines,

**Eph. ii. 17. And when He came,
He reported good tidings :**

**Peace to you, the far,
And peace to the near.**

The time of Messiah's coming cannot here be dated by His Incarnation, for then the peace was still to be made, and this coming is to report its attainment. But it would be narrowing the expression unnecessarily to limit it to the first Easter and our Lord's greeting, "Peace to you," *John* xx. 19, or to the first Ascension Day and our Lord's commission to the Eleven,

**Matt. xxviii. 18. There is given Me all authority
In heaven and on earth.**

**19. Go, therefore ;
And make all the nations disciples,
Baptising them into the Name
Of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy
Spirit,**

**20. Teaching them to keep all things,
Whatever I commanded you,
And behold, I Myself am with you all the days
Until the consummation of the age.**

On the first day of Pentecost, May 28, 30 A.D., the

proclamation of peace was certainly continued by St. Peter, who urged the Jews to be penitent and to be baptised in order to receive remission of their sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. And he added,

Acts. ii. 39. For to you is the promise,
And to your children,

And to all who are afar,
Whomsoever [the] Lord our God may call.

Further, it must have been Messiah's preaching through His Apostles, of which St. Peter spoke a little later in Solomon's portico, when he said,

Acts iii. 26. To you [Jews] firstly,
When God raised His Son [*paída*],

He sent Him, blessing you
In turning each [of you] away from your evils.

It was probably about five years later, in 35 A.D., when St. Peter again connected the Messiah's preaching with the ministry of the Apostles. In the house of Cornelius, in Palestinian Caesarea, he said,

Acts x. 36. [As to] the word, which He [God] sent to the sons
of Israel,
Reporting the good tidings of peace by means of
Jesus Christ—

He is Lord of all—

37. You yourselves know the utterance, which became
[known]
Through the whole of Judea.

And then, he defines that utterance by a summary of

Messianic history from the ministry of the Baptist to the commission on Ascension Day.

In St. Paul's own mind, the Isaian prophecy is fulfilled in the Christian preaching. So, in January, 57, he writes to the Romans from Corinth, and asks,

Rom. x. 15. But how may they proclaim,
Unless they were sent ?

According as it has been written,
"How beautiful the feet
"Of those who are reporting good news of good
things."

And besides the present passage, *Eph.* ii. 17, St. Paul will in this epistle refer to the prophecy, when he will describe the Christian warriors as having armed,

Eph. vi. 15. And sandalled themselves as to the feet
In readiness [for the preaching] of the Gospel of
peace.

Then the splendid and sustained passage finds its fitting conclusion in the words, which explain both the good tidings and the reason of the preaching. It is,

***Eph.* ii. 18. Because by means of Him, we both have the
introduction
In one Spirit towards the Father.**

In the mention of "Him," the Christ, with the Spirit and the Father, we find a reference to the Ever-Blessed Trinity, as in our next passage, *Eph.* ii. 22, *Matt.* xxviii. 19, *2 Cor.* xiii. 14, *1 Pet.* i. 2, and *Jude*, 20, 21.

We may note how the words, "we both" recall "both the [men]," who were reconciled, *Eph.* ii. 16. They are paralleled in the next line by the phrase "in one Spirit."

Indeed, that phrase serves a double purpose. The word, "one," corresponds to the word, "both"; and the words, "in Spirit," to the expression, "by means of Him." And as the word, "Father," indicates Him, to whom we are led or introduced, the whole line is parallel to its predecessor.

But "the introduction unto the Father" needs a moment's consideration. There has been some dispute as to the meaning of the Greek noun, whether it should be taken transitively as "introduction," "introducing," "the giving entrance," or intransitively as "access," "the right of admission," "entering," or "entrance." In Attic Greek, the word may be used in either sense. But it is found more frequently in the transitive sense of "introduction." And so it is regarded here by St. Chrysostom, whose commentary explicitly notes that St. Paul "did not say *pros-odos*, 'approach,' 'access,' but *pros-agōgē*, 'introduction,' for we did not approach of ourselves, but we were introduced by Him." St. Peter also, whose knowledge of this encyclical is shewn in his own, seems to comment on this very passage, and to understand the Greek word as "introduction."

1 Pet. iii. 18. Because Christ also once
Died concerning sins—

A Just [One] on behalf of unjust [ones],—
In order that He might introduce you to God.

Now, it is objected by Abbott, in his commentary, p. 67, that the verb, "we have," implies the meaning of the noun to be "access" rather than "introduction." But the words "we have the introduction" state simply enough that some one is introducing us. And this seems to be supported by the expression in *Rom.* v. 2, where the noun

pros-agōgē is connected with the verb "have" in a sentence, which anticipates much of our present passage.

Rom. v. 1. Therefore, being made just out of faith,
Let us have peace toward God,

By means of our Lord, Jesus Christ :

2. By means of Whom also, we have had the introduction

By faith into this [state of] grace, in which we stand,
And let us boast in hope of the glory of God.

As Sanday urges in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, p. 121, the idea is that of introduction to the presence-chamber of a monarch. And he follows St. Chrysostom, holding that "the rendering 'access' is inadequate, as it leaves out of sight the fact that we do not come in our own strength, but need an 'introducer'—Christ."

But Abbott, followed by Armitage Robinson in his commentary, p. 162, objects again, and suggests that the meaning "introduction" is not suitable in *Eph.* iii. 12. We reply that such a sense is not only relevant, but connects that sentence with the present one, *Eph.* ii. 18, and with that in *Rom.* v. 1, 2. For then the meaning is,

Eph. iii. 12. In Whom [Christ Jesus], we have the boldness and introduction

In confidence by means of the faith of Him,

that is, the faith in Him. In that sentence, our interior "confidence" corresponds to the received ground of "boldness"; and our subjective "faith" is parallel to the objective "introduction," given us.

Before we leave *Eph.* ii. 18, it may be well to pause on its last word, "Father." The name was originally God's, as

founder of the Israelite nation. So Moses is bidden to tell Pharaoh from Jehovah,

Exod. iv. 22. My son,
My firstborn [is] Israel.

And in his song, Moses appeals for Jehovah to His perverse people, saying,

Deut. xxxii. 6. Is not He thy Father ?
He acquired thee.

He, He made thee,
And He established thee.

Just after the death of Jeroboam II., king of Northern Israel, about 744 B.C., and the usurpature of the Assyrian throne by the warrior, Tiglath-pileser III., in 745, Hosea, most tearful, tender and intense of all lyrical poets, was inspired to plead with the factions, into which the Ten Tribes were rent. He told them in God's Name the story of God's love for Israel, even for the apostate tribes of Northern Israel ; and he said,

Hos. xi. 1. When Israel [was] a lad,
And I loved him,

And I called My son
Out of Egypt.

It is the same relation, that of nation and founder, which Isaiah expresses, when he, after Manasseh has become king of Judah in 698 B.C., writes a prologue for his own prophecies.

Is. i. 2. Hear, Heavens :
Give ear, Earth ; for Jehovah has spoken.

I nourished, and reared sons ;
And they, they revolted against Me.

A little earlier under Manasseh, the same prophet had described the faithful and tried remnant of the people as crying out for God, and saying,

Is. lxiii. 16. For Thou [art] our Father.

For Abraham did not know us ;
And Israel did not recognise us.

Thou, Jehovah, [art] our Father ;
Our Redeemer from eternity [is] Thy Name.

How figurative is such speech becomes evident in Jeremiah's first prophecy, ii-vi., in 626 B.C., as he wrote it down twenty-two years later in 604, after Nebuchadnezzar had defeated Pharaoh Necho at Carchemish. Now the Chaldeans threaten Palestine, as the Scythians have done for twenty-eight years, 635-607 B.C. And in the very moment of national peril, God gives His prophet to say,

Jer. iii. 4. Hast thou not called to Me from now,
" My Father, Thou [art] the friend of my youth."

But the metaphor of the father is blended with that of the husband,

Jer. iii. 14. " Turn back [to God],
" Sons, [who are] turning back [to sin]."

[It is] declared of Jehovah,
" For I married you."

We find the two metaphors blended again in *Jer.* iii. 19, 20. And little more than the national relationship was originally the literal sense of

Ps. ciii. 13. As a father is merciful to his children,
Jehovah is merciful to those who fear Him.

About 432 B.C. the *Book of Malachi*, that is, " of My

messenger, " *Mal.* iii. 1, speaks in God's name to the priests of Jerusalem, saying,

Mal. i. 6. A son will honour a father,
And a bondman his lord.

And if I [am] a father, where is My honour ?
And if I [am] a lord, where is My fear ?

As the last word of the Hebrew Bible on the subject, and as illustrating the same metaphorical use of the name, Father, for God's relation to Israel, we may quote from the same little scroll :

Mal. ii. 10. Is there not one Father for all of us ?
Did not one God create us ?

Why will we betray, each his brother,
To profane the covenant of our fathers ?

There are two remarkable expressions in the *Wisdom of ben-Sirach*, or *Ecclesiasticus*, written in Hebrew soon after Simon II., 219-199, that is, about the year 180 B.C. In the one, *Sirach*, xxiii. 1, there is an invocation of God as " Lord, Father and Master of my life " ; and again, in the same prayer, *Sirach*, xxiii. 4, as " Lord, Father and God of my life." This has been held to represent a relation between God and the individual soul. And it is argued that such individualism constitutes a higher stage than that of the nationalism in the Hebrew Bible. How far nationalism and individualism are inconsistent with one another, and how far they may be synthesised, we cannot examine now. It is sufficient to note that the New Testament doctrine transcends each and the synthesis of the two. God is indeed the Father of the individual Christian ; but that is because He is primarily Father of all Christians, taken collectively. The Christian is not an isolated atom,

but a member of our Lord's Mystical Body, one of His holy [ones]. It is from the Head of the Body, he learns to say, "Our Father," *Matt.* vi. 9, as it is the One Spirit, who animates the whole body with supernatural life, and teaches each member of it to cry, "Abba," *Gal.* iv. 6.

Eph. ii., 19, 20. Figures of the Church.

Having, then, in the One Spirit, an introduction towards the Father, by means of the Christ, there follow a state and a position, *Eph.* ii. 19, 20, which form a fulcrum for the future, *Eph.* ii. 21, 22.

St. Paul had spoken of the Gentiles as

Eph. ii. 12. Having been estranged from the commonwealth of Israel,
And [being] foreigners from the covenants of the Promise.

Now he has just described the introduction of both Jews and Gentiles into the same new position for both. And he hastens to draw the conclusion for the Gentiles. This, he commences with a "therefore," or rather with the "therefore, then," he uses so frequently, though the Attic writers only use the expression in a contracted form and interrogatively. He says,

Eph. ii. 19. Therefore, then, you are no longer foreigners and sojourners,
But you are fellow-citizens of the holy [ones]
and members-of-the-household of God—

In the parallelism, *sun-politai*, so spelt according to the true reading, and meaning "fellow-citizens," is set against *xenoi*, "foreigners"; and *oikeioi*, "members of the household," against *par-oikoi*, "sojourners." And in discussing

Eph. ii. 12, we found that the *xenos*, or "foreigner," was distinguished from the citizens, from the slaves, and from the *met-oikos*, the "settler," who was allowed to live in Athens under a tax, but without rights. The *par-oikos*, or "sojourner," of the present verse, is the same as the *met-oikos*, or "settler." And he is distinguished from the citizen by St. Paul's contemporary, Philo, in his tract *on the Cherubim*, and in such Greek inscriptions as that of Carpathos, in the second century B.C., according to Hiller de Gaertringen's *Greek Inscriptions*, i. 1033,⁹, and those of Pergamum, in 133 B.C., according to Fränkel's *Inscriptions of Pergamum*, 249, 12, 20, 34.

Against the fastidious purists, who object to the word for "fellow-citizen," found here as well as in Josephus, *Antiquities*, XIX. ii. 2, and in some inscriptions and papyri of the second century A.D., we may point out that it is also used by Euripides in his *Heracleidae*, 826, written about 418 B.C.

It is interesting to note how the *oikos*, or "house," as an element in the word, *par-oikoi*, "sojourners," suggests the next figure of speech, in which St. Paul speaks of the converted Gentiles as God's *oikeioi*, members or friends of the family. And having carried the Apostle from the metaphor of the city-state to that of the family, it carries him from the metaphor of the family to that of a building. This "house," or building, like "the house" in the Temple, is God's Sanctuary. And St. Paul will speak of it as growing, *Eph.* ii. 21, the metaphor of a body being also in his mind. So it appears that St. Paul illustrates the unity of Gentile with Jew, and of both with God, by four different metaphors, the city-state, the family, the Temple and the body.

All four metaphors are blended in this one passage, since it is said that the Gentiles became fellow-citizens

in God's commonwealth and members of God's household,

Eph. ii. 20. When you were built up on the foundation
Of the apostles and prophets,

Its corner[-stone] being
Christ Jesus.

The reference to the body will be made in the word
"grows" in the next couplet,

Eph. ii. 21. In whom, every building, being conjoined,
Grows into a holy Sanctuary in [the] Lord.

We render the passive participle in the aorist or indefinite past tense as "when you were built up." In that expression, we represent the prefix *epi* by "up," to suggest the successive layers implied. Then, the form of the verb signifies that the Gentiles became fellow-citizens in the New Jerusalem and members of God's family at the time of their conversion. The change took place at once without a long course of mystical or other training. Further, the word for "foundation" is in the dative case, suggesting "rest on the foundation" instead of the motion towards it, indicated by the accusative, or the nearness to it, implied by the genitive. As to "the foundation of the apostles and prophets," it is not the foundation, belonging to the apostles and prophets, or one which owes its origin to them. But it is the foundation, formed by the apostles and prophets, just as "the partition of the fence," in *Eph.* ii. 14, meant "the partition, that is, the fence," and "the breastplate of justice," in *Eph.* vi. 14, will mean "the breastplate, consisting in justice."

It will be well to consider the words, "prophets" and

“corner[-stone]” before attempting to elicit the further meaning of this most significant metaphor.

The “prophets” here have been identified by Origen and St. Chrysostom with those of the Old Testament. And it needs some courage even to question an interpretation by those masters of Pauline speech. Wordsworth, in his commentary, p. 202, makes too light of the fact that both the apostles and the prophets are included as one class under one article in the Greek. For he would represent St. Paul as shewing that the reconciliation of Jews and Gentiles is harmonious with the Divine Plan in both Testaments. And it is true, as Moule acknowledges in his commentary, p. 83, that the Old Testament prophets are regarded in the New Testament as evangelists before the time, *Luke* xxiv. 25, *Acts* iii. 18, 21, 24, x. 43, *Rom.* xvi. 26. We must, however, recognise that there is but one article, embracing both apostles and prophets. Further, the apostles are placed first. Finally and conclusively, the plural nouns, “apostles” and “prophets” occur three times in this encyclical; they are conjoined on each occasion; and in the two other places, they undoubtedly represent New Testament apostles and prophets. In *Eph.* iii. 5, it is said that the Holy Spirit now reveals the full salvation of the Gentiles to God’s holy apostles and prophets. And in *Eph.* iv. 11, we are told that the ascended Christ gave some men as apostles, and some men as prophets to His Church.

We need not now dwell on the large part played by prophets in the early Church. We readily recall the ministry of Agabus in foretelling in 44 A.D., the famine of 45 and 46, *Acts* xi. 28, and in foretelling in May, 57, the arrest of St. Paul, which followed about Pentecost, May 28, of that year, *Acts* xxi. 11. We remember also the Antiochian prophets, *Acts* xiii. 1, as well as Judas and

Silas, *Acts* xv. 32. Prophecy was one of the spiritual gifts, *1 Cor.* xii. 10, 29, xiv. 6, 29. Indeed, it was that gift, which St. Paul desired most for the Church, *1 Cor.* xiv. 1, 5, as it built up, encouraged, and consoled, *1 Cor.* xiv. 3.

Although prophets are not mentioned by St. Clement of Rome in 95, by St. Ignatius or St. Polycarp in 115, or even by him, who wrote *the Epistle of Barnabas* between 70 and 79 A.D., yet it is plain that such persons were very active in the first century. They are most prominent in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, x. 7, xi. 3, 7-12, xiii. xv. 1, 2, written in Syria before 90 A.D. They are discussed in the *Shepherd* of Hermas, "Mandate" xi.; and we follow Zahn, Salmon, Caspari and Alzog in dating that book about 95 A.D. Hort's objection that Hermas used Theodotion's translation of *Daniel*, made under Cómmodus, between 180 and 192 A.D., falls to the ground, because some passages of the *Apocalypse*, ix. 20, x. 6, xii. 7, xiii. 7, xix. 6, xx. 4 and xx. 11, shew that Theodotion used a version already known to St. John in 95. And the statement of the *Muratorian Fragment* that the *Shepherd* was written by the brother of Pope Pius I., between 140 and 155 A.D., is unreliable, on account of the author's evident desire to discredit the *Shepherd* as recent.

As to the "corner[-stone]," St. Paul writes,

Eph. ii. 20c. Its corner[-stone] being
Christ Jesus.

So the clause would suggest that our Lord is the Corner[-stone] of the foundation. But some would render the words as

Himself being corner [-stone],
Christ Jesus.

In that case, our Lord would be represented as corner[-stone] of the whole building, rather than of the foundation.

And the distinction between Him on the one hand, and the apostles and prophets on the other, would be emphasised. Certainly, such a translation is grammatically possible, and would not require an article to be inserted before "Christ Jesus." But if we look at the order of the words, and compare the couplet with the preceding one, we may note that the "foundation" is followed by the explanatory "apostles and prophets," and similarly the "corner[-stone]" is followed by the explanatory "Christ Jesus." Therefore, the word for "corner[-stone]" ought to be defined by some other word, lest our Lord should be pictured as "a corner[-stone]," one among others. There is no definite article; and therefore, we must find the defining word in *autoû*, which follows the word for "corner[-stone]." Since *autoû* is a defining word, it must mean "its," and not "Himself." So, the lines should be rendered,

Its corner[-stone] being
Christ Jesus.

As to the corner[-stone], we note that Isaiah, probably in 726, when Hezekiah had been a year on the throne of Judah, urged the people to seek their release from the Assyrian tribute in Jehovah, and not in necromancy, or in an alliance with Egypt. In the course of his speech, he said,

Is. xxviii. 16. Therefore, thus said Lord Jehovah,
Behold Me—

He founded in Zion a stone,
A stone of testing,

A corner[-stone] of preciousness,
Of a foundation founded—

He who believes
Will not be ashamed.

So we render the passage, reading *yēbhōsh*, "he will be ashamed," with the Greek Vulgate, rather than *yāchīsh*, "he will make haste," with the Massoretic Hebrew text.

Now the word "corner[-stone]" is used to represent the Hebrew word, *pinnāh*, "a corner," which the Greek Vulgate translates by *akro-gōniaios*, that is, [the stone] *ep'ákras gōnias*, "at the apex of the angle." The Attic form was *gōniaios*, without *akro-*. The Hellenist form is found only in the Greek Vulgate of this Isaian verse; in the present passage of St. Paul's *Epistle to the Ephesians*; in the quotation, which Hort, in his comment on 1 *Pet.* ii. 6, shows St. Peter to have made indirectly through St. Paul; in patristic references; and in *Psalms* cxviii. 22, and 2 *Kings* xxv. 17, according to the Greek version of Symmachus about 200 A.D. In *Psalms* cxviii. 22, however, the Hebrew term is "head of the corner." This, in spite of much that has been said, is not identical with the "corner[-stone]," which binds the walls, and sustains the superstructure, but rather the top-stone, completing the building, as Kirkpatrick suggests in his commentary on the *Psalms*, p. 698, or the top-stone of the battlement, as Cheyne insists in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, i. 913.

We may note in passing that the Pauline figure does not present the Jews and the Gentiles as two walls, the Christ being the corner-stone and bond. On the contrary, it is part of St. Paul's doctrine that Jews and Gentiles do not exist as such in the Church. The building is homogeneous, both Jew and Gentile being raised from the same level of spiritual death to the same position in the Divine Life.

St. Paul borrows the metaphor of the corner-stone from *Is.* xxviii. 16. As Driver, *Isaiah*, p. 52, points out, Isaiah had taken it from the huge and costly foundation stones, upon which the Temple rested, 1 *Kings* v. 17. Eighty feet below the present surface of the ground, thanks to the

achievement of the Palestine Exploration Fund, men may to-day look on the Temple's foundation-stones, as these lie on the solid rock. At the angles, there are great corner-stones, that at the south-east angle weighing about 100 tons, and another at the south-west angle measuring 38 feet 9 inches in length. If it be objected that the number of those corner-stones is inconsistent with the Headship of our Lord, we answer that it is impossible in St. Paul's figures and St. John's Apocalyptic symbols to make the illustration walk on all fours. It is sufficient, if the figurative or symbolic expression can convey the thought, and render it more vivid by the pictorial presentment.

It matters nothing, therefore, if two metaphors are blended into one, or if the one object is described on different occasions by different metaphors. In the description of the Church as a building, our Lord describes Himself as the Builder, and He depicts St. Peter as the foundation of the House, saying in Aramaic,

Matt. xvi. 18. But I also—I say to thee that thou art
Kîpha' [Rock];
 And I will build My Church on this
Kîpha' [Rock].

And again, He presents St. Peter as the steward of the House, and Grand Vizier of the kingdom—

Matt. xvi. 19. I will give to thee the keys
 Of the kingdom of the heavens.

Then St. Paul uses a different figure in writing his *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, iii. 10, 11. He represents himself and those who continue his work as the builders, and our Lord as the one foundation. And in St. Paul's *Second Epistle to St. Timothy*, ii. 19, "the firm foundation"

consists of the faithful, sealed as known to the Lord and as averse from injustice, 1 *Tim.* iii. 15, 2 *Tim.* ii. 20. Further, St. John, in his *Apocalypse*, xxi., pictures the building as that of a city, which has the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb as its Temple and Light, and the names of the twelve Apostles on its foundation-stones. We have already seen that St. Paul, in his passage of this *Epistle to the Ephesians*, blends together the metaphors of city, family, body and temple.

As we have followed the order of the Greek words in

Eph. ii. 20c. Its corner[-stone] being
Christ Jesus,

there is no abruptness in the next clause,

Eph. ii. 21. In whom, every building, being conjoined,
Grows into a holy Sanctuary in [the] Lord.

So St. Paul passes from the metaphorical presentation of our Lord as corner-stone to the original presentation of Him as enfolding the Church within His own life.

Eph. ii. 21a. A Disputed Reading, "the."

Before we undertake to interpret the next verse,

Eph. ii. 21. In whom, every building, being conjoined,
Grows into a holy Sanctuary in [the] Lord,

it will be necessary to settle an important, but seemingly insignificant question as to the text. Ought we to read "every building" or "all the building?" The difference depends on the absence or the presence of the article *hē*. This the uncial or majuscule manuscripts would present simply as H, which we represent by *ē*. If the Greek is *pâsa* alone, we should translate it by "every." But if it is *hē pâsa*, then we render it "all the,"

It would appear that Origen read the article in his text, though it is omitted in the *Catēna* of Corderius in 1630, p. 64, in the only existent manuscript, and in the original form of von der Goltz's Athos manuscript. St. Jerome represents Origen's reading by *universa*, "the whole," corresponding to *hē pāsa*, not by *omnis*, "every," corresponding to *pāsa*; Cramer's *Catēnæ* of 1842, attributes the article to Origen's text; and Origen's comment contains, and implies it.

St. Chrysostom, who wrote before 398, is quoted on both sides. On p. 44, in the text, he inserts the article, and on p. 45, he omits it. His imitators do not help us to ascertain his evidence, for Theophylact, about 1077, inserts the article, and Theodoret, about 423, omits it.

It is also difficult to ascertain St. Basil's reading, though it would have been most useful as a clue to Origen's. But, according to the Benedictine edition, the article is omitted in his book *against Eunomius*, p. 276, about 359 A.D., and inserted in his *Morals*, p. 317, and in the work *on Baptism*, p. 645, attributed to him.

The Armenian version, made after 431, has the article, which is found also in the fourth century corrector of the Sinaitic Aleph, in the Alexandrian A and Ephraem C, both uncials of the fifth century, in the Alexandrian deacon, Euthalius, of 458, and in the Porphyrian P, of the ninth century.

There are reasons why a scribe should insert the article. With it, the sense is plain, and the exegesis easy. The word for "building" came to be understood much more in its concrete meaning, and would receive the article to define what building was intended. On the other hand, there is no reason why a scribe should omit the article, if it was in his copy. It has indeed been suggested that it was omitted through *homoio-teleuton*, or "like-ending." The

scribe, it is said, read *hē oikōdōmē* ; but looking back to his copy, the second *ē* caught his eye. However, a moment's consideration will show that, in such a case, the noun, and not the article, would have disappeared. And as a general rule, the article is seldom omitted or inserted by accident.

In favour of omitting the article, there is evidence in the different forms of the text. The Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, both probably of Caesarea and 331 A.D., omit it. To these, we must add the Alexandrian form of the text in the cursive 17, of Cent. ix. or x. The Western Text also omits the article, according to the Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., its copy, the Sangerman E, of Cent. ix., and the twin uncials, the Augien F and the Boernerian G, of Cent. ix. With these, we include the Gothic version, which was affected by the Western Text after the Lombards' invasion of Italy in 568, and omits the article in this passage. Then the Syrian Text, represented by the Moscovian K and the Angelic L, both of the ninth century, and by the cursives, 47, of Cent. xi., and 37, of Cent. xv. lacks the article. So there is no need to dwell on the fact that the word is also omitted by *the Exposition of the True Faith*, 5, attributed to St. Justin Martyr, and by *the Clementines*, p. 787, in the Antwerp edition of 1698.

Eph. ii., 21, 22. The Future.

The difficulty is now one of interpretation. How can we harmonise the expression "every building" with the oneness of the building? To avoid this difficulty, several, such as Eadie, Barry, Moule, Meyrick and Alexander, have argued that Hellenistic Greek does not require the article in this case. But the instances, given by Alexander in his commentary, do not bear out his contention, for the omission of the article in *Luke* iv. 13, *Acts* ii. 36, *Acts* vii. 22, *Eph.* iii. 15, and Josephus, *Antiquities*, IV. v. 1, is significant.

And we should make the same comment on such instances as *Col.* i. 15, iv. 12, and 2 *Tim.* iii. 16.

Others have sought to escape from the difficulty by turning to the word *oikōdōmē*, "building." They point out that the word is certainly used in a concrete sense of the Temple "buildings" in *Matthew* xxiv. 1, *Mark* xiii. 1, 2, in *Hermas*, "Similitude," i, 1, and in *Barnabas* xvi. 1. They urge also, that it is not used in that sense of an edifice, but in the sense of "building-operation" in such cases as 1 *Cor.* iii. 9, where it is parallel to agriculture, in the *Epistle of St. Ignatius to the Ephesians*, ix., and in the *Shepherd of Hermas*, "Vision," iii. 2. They err, however, in quoting 2 *Cor.* v. 1, as an instance of "building" in the sense of a process, for the word is parallel to "a house,"

2 *Cor.* v. 1. We have a building from God,
A house unhandmade.

It is clear, then, that *oikōdōmē*, like our English word "building," may mean a product or a process, a building or a building enterprise. And the question now takes form as a choice between Westcott's rendering and Armitage Robinson's. The former translates the Greek as "every building," explaining the expression by the council chambers, treasuries, priests' chambers, cloisters, all become part of the Sanctuary. The latter renders the words as "all [the] building," and suggests the paraphrase, "all building that is carried on."

If we look at the Pauline context, we see that the Sanctuary is the result of growth and conjoining. Now, the word "conjoined" implies several parts, as it implies several parts in the structure of the body, to which St. Paul will presently apply it, *Eph.* iv. 16. Nor does the unity of the plan and result require a single building, for that unity is effectually expressed in the unity of the

Sanctuary. St. Paul has so emphasised, and will so emphasise the unity of the Church, that it seems irrelevant to suggest sects or local churches by the expression, "every building." And ever since the need of Catholic unity was urged by the epistles of St. Ignatius in 115 A.D., and made a very practical question by the sects of the second century, our Lord's prayer for unity, *John* xvii. 11, 21, 22, 23, has been a dominant thought in the minds of His faithful.

In the present passage, however, it is not a question of factions, such as those of Corinth, *1 Cor.* i. 12, or of local churches, such as those of Roman Asia, *Apoc.* i. 4. But St. Paul emphasised the variety of operations in the Church, which he figured as a body, when he wrote to the Corinthians six years ago in the autumn of 55, *1 Cor.* xii. 4-30. Presently, he will do so again, *Eph.* iv. 11-16. At this moment, he is indicating the variety in the Catholic Church, pictured as a Sanctuary. If we would find something parallel, it would not be in sects or local churches, but in some Catholic University, in which there are courses of humanities, science, philosophy and theology, each building its own building, but each building conjointed with every other. Each is a necessary part in the one plan; and each grows with all the others into one holy Sanctuary of Catholic Truth.

Therefore, we have no hesitation in rendering the lines as,

**Eph. ii. 21. In Whom, every building, being conjointed,
Grows into a holy Sanctuary in [the] Lord.**

The Greek word for "being conjointed" is a present participle, for the conjoining, like the growing, is proceeding now. The verb is here compounded with *sun-*, or *syn-*, "together," and in this form is found only in this passage and in *Eph.* iv. 16. Without that prefix, the verb,

harmō-logēin, is a compound of *harmós*, "a fitting," and *lēgein*, "to collect." It was formed on the analogy of *lithō-lógos*, "a chooser of stones," and afterwards, "a fitter of stones." But in *harmō-logēin*, the second part of the word had little significance. The use of the word, illustrated by Armitage Robinson, in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, pp. 260-263, is the best guide to its meaning. For this, we have the inscriptions at Eleusis in the fourth century B.C., *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum*, iv. 1054 b.; those of the second century B.C., belonging to the temple of Zeus at Boeotian Lebadeia, *Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum*, G.S. i. 3073; the passage by Sextus Empiricus, in his book *Against the Mathematicians*, V. 78, towards the end of the second century A.D.; and a sentence of the *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, written by Andrew, the bishop of Cappadocian Caesarea, about 550 A.D. From these instances, it appears that the verb includes the whole process, by which stones are prepared and fitted together.

At this point, we may turn to a parallel passage in the epistle, which St. Paul has just written to the Colossians. There we read of the Christ,

Col. ii. 19. From Whom all the body—

By means of the bands and co-bonds,

Being fully supplied, and being brought together—

Grows with the growth of God,

that is, with the growth, of which God is the source and goal. Here the Church is compared to a body, and its increase to the growth of a body. In *Eph.* ii. 21, to which we return, St. Paul is comparing the Church to a Sanctuary. But the other metaphor is in his mind; and so he applies the idea of growth to "every building," saying,

Eph. ii. 21b. It grows into a holy Sanctuary in [the] Lord.

Indeed, so closely are the metaphors of the body and the building interwoven in St. Paul's mind, that presently, when he will speak of the Church as a body, he will regard that body as being built, *Eph.* iv. 12, 16.

We note the employment of the Greek verb *auxei* in the intransitive sense of "grows," or "increases," like the Latin *cresco*, this being a later use, found in Aristotle, but not in his master, Plato.

The word for "Sanctuary" is *naós*, from *naíō*, "I dwell," and denotes the shrine or sanctuary, not the whole *hiērón*, the whole sacred place and enclosure. In the Temple at Jerusalem, the *hiērón*, or "sacred" place, would include the courts and buildings; but the *naós* would be the House, divided into the Holy and the Most Holy Place. The expression, "a holy sanctuary," is emphatic; and the phrase, "in [the] Lord," takes the place of the phrase "in Christ." It is evident that the title "Lord" is more appropriate here, because the process of growth suggests this earthly scene. And the phrase "in [the] Lord" is more expressive of His dominion over our conduct here, than the phrase "in Christ," which suggests the heavenly scene and our mystical union with Him there.

These two lines are applied specially to the Gentiles by the two lines, which follow. If the first line of this couplet said,

Eph. ii. 21a. In Whom, every building, being conjoined,

the first of the next couplet will say,

Eph. ii. 22a. In Whom, you also are being built together.

The second line of this couplet,

Eph. ii. 21b. Grows into a holy Sanctuary in [the] Lord,

will be paralleled by the second line of the next,

Eph. ii. 22b. Unto a dwelling-place of God in [the] Spirit.

Here, then, is the final aim and purpose of the Catholic Church. There is no thought of the Ephesian temple to Artemis, or of any other pagan shrine. The Sanctuary of the Jewish Temple was the source of the figure, applied by our Blessed Lord to His own real Body, *John* ii. 19, and by His Apostle to His Mystical Body, *1 Cor.* iii. 16, *2 Cor.* vi. 16, *Eph.* ii. 21. In the Church, indeed,

Exod. xv. 17. Jehovah, Thou hast wrought a place for Thy dwelling.

That it is Jerusalem, and not Ephesus, which suggests the Temple imagery, is hardly disputable ; but it is placed beyond question by the comment, which St. Peter made on the passage in the spring of 63, two years after it was written. Having spoken of our Lord as a living stone, he adds,

1 Pet. ii. 5. And you yourselves, as living stones, are being built [As] a spiritual House [with a view] unto a holy priesthood,

To offer up spiritual sacrifices,
Acceptable to God by means of Jesus Christ.

The Greek word for "dwelling-place" in our present passage, *Eph.* ii. 22, *kat-oikētērion*, occurs only here, and in the *Apocalypse*, xviii. 2, St. John apparently borrowing it to contrast pagan Rome, "a dwelling-place of demons," with the Catholic Church, "a dwelling-place of God."

Finally, we find in this couplet,

Eph. ii. 22. In Whom, you also are being built together
Unto a dwelling-place of God in [the] Spirit,

a climax to the story of Gentile restoration, which began with the words,

Eph. ii. 19. Therefore, then, you are no longer foreigners and sojourners.

And as these words conclude another passage of sustained thought and emotion, they implicitly contain an ascription of praise to the Ever-Blessed Trinity, God the Father, Christ and the Spirit, Whose Divine Life and Love are the Life and Energy of the Church.

CHAPTER III

ST. PAUL'S MINISTRY

In the first chapter, St. Paul announced God's eternal covenant. In the second, he showed how it is realised in time. And now, in the third, he will tell us of his own ministry in its regard. The second chapter ended, as we read, with one of those passages, in which the Apostle seems on the point of lifting the veil from the invisible world and the glory of God. The pulse of his soul has been beating rapidly; and now again it falls. His mind, returning from its rapture, becomes conscious of itself. Overwhelmed by the wisdom and love in God's purpose for all the nations of the world, he would have fallen on his knees. Already, he has commenced to say,

Eph. iii. 1. For sake of this, I—

but he breaks off suddenly. He had been about to say,

Eph. iii. 14. For sake of this—I bend my knees toward the Father—

and then he would have uttered his "second prayer," *Eph.* iii. 14-19. But for the moment, there is an interruption. The Apostle must interject an account of his own work in the realisation of God's purpose.

It is true that he himself stood for the catholicity of the Church and for the conversion of the Roman Empire. His strenuous battle for vital principles had invested his name

and person with unique significance. And fourteen years of suffering, since he went forth on his first missionary journey in 47 A.D., had written their persuasive story in scars and wrinkles on his bowed form and Jewish features. But, scholar and gentleman and Christian as he truly was, there was no self-assertion in his self-consciousness. When he tells the tale of his achievements, he crowns it with a smile and the story of his escape in a basket, 2 *Cor.* xi. 33, *Acts*, ix. 25.

In this long parenthesis, *Eph.* iii. 1-13, there are two tides of thought. In the first, iii. 1-7, he unfolds again "the mystery of the Christ," the full adoption of the Gentiles by the Jewish Christ or Messiah. In the second, iii. 8-13, he will again unveil the purpose of that mystery and Divine secret. The first tide flows in three waves. The first of these, *Eph.* iii. 1-3b, deals with St. Paul's commission; the second, iii. 3c, 4, forms a parenthesis within the parenthesis; and the third, iii. 5-7, gives an explanation of St. Paul's preaching.

***Eph.* iii. 1-3b. St. Paul's Commission.**

The Apostle was beginning his prayer and thanksgiving for the Gentiles; and he had written,

***Eph.* iii. 1. For sake of this, I—**

that is, on this ground, he—but the chain pulls his wrist, or the soldier speaks, or in some other way, he is recalled from heaven to earth. So he writes,

***Eph.* iii. 1. Paul, the prisoner of the Christ Jesus,
On behalf of you, the nations—**

"Paul" is set over against "you," and "the prisoner of Christ Jesus" against "the nations." Therefore, we do not follow St. Chrysostom in interpolating "am," as if

the sentence should run : " I, Paul, [am] the prisoner." Indeed, in that case, the Greek rule would require the omission of the article before " prisoner." With Origen and St. Jerome, we acknowledge the break in the sentence. With Theodore and Theodoret, we recognise its resumption in *Eph.* iii. 14.

In that letter for Philemon, which Onesimus holds in his hand, St. Paul has just spoken of himself, not as " an apostle," but as " a prisoner of Christ Jesus," and as one " in the bonds of the Gospel," *Philem.* 9, 13. And indeed, his imprisonment was according to his Master's will and for the sake of his Master's cause. Through it, God's kingdom would be proclaimed in the Emperor's palace, *Acts* ix. 15, xxvii. 24, *Phil.* i. 13, iv. 22.

But now he adds,

Eph. iii. 1b. On behalf of you, the nations—

This imprisonment advances the cause of the Gentiles, as it gains St. Paul an audience of the Imperial house, and of the Empire through the Imperial house. But the cause of the Gentiles was the human occasion of his bonds as well as the Divine purpose in them. Three years ago, at Pentecost, in May, 58, he had been assaulted by a Jewish mob in the Temple, because Jewish pilgrims from Asia Minor thought he had introduced the Ephesian Trophimus, within the *Soreg* wall, *Acts.* xxi. 29. Allowed to address them, he told them of his conversion, of his return to Jerusalem, and of his vision then in the Temple, *Acts* xxii. 6-21, ix. 28. Once more, he roused them to fury by repeating what he had heard of our Lord in the trance,

Acts xxii. 21. " Go, for I—unto nations afar—

" I will send thee forth."

Carried to Cæsarea, he was accused before Felix of profaning the Temple, that is, by introducing a Gentile. In his

own defence before Agrippa, he made it clear that his conversion included a commission to the Gentiles, and that such a commission was foretold in the Messianic prophecies, *Acts* xxvi. 17, 20-23.

As this passage of the encyclical is written in the ebb of thought and emotion, we do not expect the same intensity, reach and originality, as in the preceding verses. Grace builds on nature, even in inspiration. And at this moment, the brain and heart of the Apostle are recovering from their strain. So the level and the theme are not sustained. Having mentioned the nations, he breaks off his speech again to say,

**Eph. iii. 2. If at least you heard of the stewardship
Of the grace of God,**

**Which [grace] was given to me
[With a view] unto you,**

**3. That according to revelation,
The Mystery was made known to me.**

And then, instead of defining the Mystery at once, as he proposed to do, he inserts another parenthesis, 3c. 4, even within this parenthesis, iii. 1-13.

As to the words, "If at least you heard," Moule explains them as ironical; and Alexander, as expressive of gentle assurance. Abbott holds them decisive against the supposition that the epistle was addressed to a church, which had been instructed personally by the writer. Westcott, however, does not find them inconsistent with such a supposition. According to Armitage Robinson's compromise, the words imply that some at least among the readers had only heard of the Apostle, and had no personal acquaintance with him. We explain the language here and other features of the epistle by recognising St. Paul's

primary intention of writing to the Ephesians, as he had written to the Colossians, and by noting how his outlook changes as he writes swiftly and fervidly. His mind now anticipates the journey of Tychicus to the churches of the Lycus Valley, which he himself had never seen. Now it turns from those congregations to address the Gentiles, as he had turned from the congregations of Rome to address the Jews, *Rom.* ii. 17, and the Gentiles, *Rom.* xi. 13, separately or together. The words, "if at least you heard," are indeed, as in *Eph.* iv. 21, conditional; but the condition in both places may well be rhetorical, not implying any real doubt.

The Apostle refers to "the stewardship of God's grace." Already, he has told us of Messiah's position as steward of the fulness of the seasons, *Eph.* i. 10, that is, as administrator of God's kingdom. That kingdom is a reign of grace, so the stewardship involves the dispensing of grace. It is a stewardship of the grace of God. That grace was given to St. Paul, that he might convey it to the Gentiles. So the stewardship in the present passage, as in *1 Cor.* ix. 17, is St. Paul's but, of course, it is his only as he is delegated by the Messiah, the Christ. This is made more explicit in the parallel passage of the *Epistle to the Colossians*,

Col. i. 24. Now I rejoice in the sufferings on behalf of you
And I supplement on my part the deficits

Of the afflictions of the Christ
In my flesh,

On behalf of His Body,
Which is the Church,

25. Of which I became a minister,
According to the stewardship of God,

Which was given to me [with a view] unto you—
To fill the word of God [with the fruit of preaching].

In *Col.* i. 25, and *Eph.* iii. 2, the stewardship is St. Paul's. In the earlier passage, the words, "which was given to me [with a view] unto you," plainly refer to "the stewardship." But in the later passage, they refer to "the grace," as the grammar connects "which was given" with "the grace." So twelve years ago, in 49, St. Paul wrote to the Galatians, *Gal.* ii. 9, of "the grace, which was given me"; to the Corinthians, *1 Cor.* iii. 10, nearly six years ago, in 55; and to the Romans, *Rom.* xii. 3, xv. 15, a little more than four years ago, in January, 57. Now, in a few moments, he will use the expression again.

To explain his stewardship, the Apostle begins by saying,

Eph. iii. 3. That according to revelation,
The Mystery was made known to me—

Of course, that is only a beginning. He will then digress, iii. 3c, 4, to indicate his knowledge of the Mystery. Resuming, he will not deal immediately with his own stewardship, but he will return first to the Mystery, the Divine Secret. Closing with the word "Gospel," *Eph.* iii. 6, he will then tell how he became a minister of it by God's grace and power, *Eph.* iii. 7. So he will return to his own stewardship under the stewardship of the Christ.

We may note that the Mystery was made known to St. Paul according to revelation. Revelation was the means of communication. When the revelations are referred to as specific, definite facts, the phrase is, "by means of revelation," as in *Gal.* i. 12. There is a connection between the revelation and the stewardship; for the revelation of the mystery had regard to the plan for the Gentiles; and the stewardship of the grace was St. Paul's office in the execution of the plan. Both are connected by St. Paul with his conversion. Writing to the churches of southern Galatia in 49, he said of that conversion,

Gal. i. 15. But when He pleased—

(Who separated me from [the time I was in] my
mother's womb,

And called [me] by means of His grace)—

16. To reveal His Son in me,

In order that I may preach Him in the nations—

And in the summer of 59, not two years ago, describing that conversion to Herod Agrippa II. in the castle at Palestinian Cæsarea, he told how our Lord had said to him on that occasion,

Acts xxvi. 16. But stand up,

And stand on thy feet ;

For I appeared to thee unto this [end],

To appoint thee [as] a servant and witness

Both of those things, [in] which thou didst see me,
And of those things, [in] which I will appear to
thee,

17. Taking thee out of [the hands of] the [Jewish]
people

And out of [the hands of] the [Gentile] nations,

Unto whom [the nations] I send thee [or, make
thee an apostle]

18. To open their eyes,

That they may turn from darkness unto light

And [from] the authority of Satan unto God,

That they may receive remission of sins,

And an allotment among those, who have been
sanctified

By faith

The [faith] in Me.

If we date the conversion of St. Paul three years after our Lord's Crucifixion on Good Friday, April 7, 30, and therefore in 33 A.D., we should date his next visit to

Jerusalem in 35, when he spent a fortnight there after three years, reckoned in Jewish fashion, in the Arabian desert near Damascus, *Acts* ix. 26, *Gal.* i. 18. Then, in the Temple, our Lord again appeared to him in vision, saying,

Acts. xxii. 21. Go, for I—unto nations afar—
I will send thee forth.

But the occasion does not come for thirteen years more. Then having evangelised Cyprus in 47, he will seek Pamphylia ; and very probably under the stress of malarial fever, he will cross the Taurus in 48. In the synagogue of Pisidian Antioch, he will close the great scene there by answering the contradicting Jews to the joy of the Gentiles present, *Acts* xiii. 45-48, saying,

Acts. xiii. 46. To you, it was necessary that first of all
The word of God be spoken.

Since you reject it,
And judge yourselves not worthy of eternal life,

Behold, we turn unto the nations—

47. For so, the Lord has commanded us.

And he quotes the Messianic commission of Isaiah xlix. 6 :

“ I have set thee for a light of nations,

“ That thou be for salvation unto [the] end of the earth.”

Then after twelve years of storm and stress, he reaches Rome in March, 60, and meets the representatives of the Roman Ghetto, situated then in the Trastevere of to-day. He reasons with them all day long, and then says,

Acts. xxviii. 28. Therefore, let it be known to you
That to the nations was sent

This, the Salvation of God—
They also will hear.

Eph. iii. 3c, 4. A Parenthesis within the Parenthesis.

Having mentioned his own stewardship and knowledge of the mystery, St. Paul enters upon another digression, saying,

Eph. iii. 3c. (According as I wrote before in a little—
4. [Looking] toward which, you are able—
[while you are] reading—

To apprehend my comprehension
In the Mystery of the Christ.

The verb "I wrote," is the "epistolary aorist," as the present participle, "reading," and the use of "I wrote" in 1 *Cor.* v. 9, and 1 *Pet.* v. 12, will show. So, it is equivalent to "I have written." Therefore, with Theodoret, Theophylact, Darby, Moule, Alexander, Abbott, Westcott, and Armitage Robinson, in their commentaries, we hold St. Paul's reference to be to earlier passages of the present epistle, *Eph.* i. 9, 10, and ii. 11-13; although Gore interprets it of the *Epistle to the Colossians* i. 24-29, iv. 3, 4; and St. Chrysostom, Calvin, Rickaby and others, of a lost epistle.

The phrase, "in a little," or "briefly" is found once again in the Greek Testament in the reply of Herod Agrippa II. to St. Paul's appeal, the former saying ironically, as it is generally thought,

Acts xxvi. 28. In a little, thou art persuading me
To make [myself] a Christian!

That may indeed mean, "you think to persuade me in a little time to accept your nonconformist ideas, and to join your heretical and plebeian sect, at the cost of forsaking the Judaism, which I cherish and propagate, and of abandoning the Temple, which I hope to complete within

two or three years." In any case, the phrase, "in a little," means "in a little [time]," as in *Wisdom* iv. 13, or "in a little [space]," as in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* iii. 11.

"[Looking] toward which" is an unusual expression in English, and may therefore serve the better to render the unusual phrase in Greek. The lines evidently mean, "Having regard to what I have already written on this subject, brief as it is, you will be able, while you are reading it, to apprehend by your intelligence, *noûs*, how much of the Christ's special mystery and Divine secret, I am able to comprehend by my faculty of right judgment and power of 'putting things together,' *sûnēsis*, Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* vi. 10. It has been pointed out that there is a remarkable parallel to the Pauline phrase, "my comprehension in the mystery of the Christ," in *Third Esdras* i. 33, written between 170 and 100 B.C., at Alexandria, and telling of Josiah's "comprehension in the law of the Lord." We may note also in passing that the preposition "in" is due to the Hebrew idiom, preserved in the "comprehend in" of the Greek Vulgate.

Eph. iii. 5-7. The Preaching of St. Paul.

The Apostle resumes his original parenthesis. He broke off at the words, "the mystery." Now the words, "the mystery of the Christ" recall his theme. It is this mystery, which determines St. Paul's relation to ancient Israel, to the Gentiles, and to God. First of all, he will indicate the relation of the mystery to the Jewish dispensation. It is the mystery,

Eph. iii. 5. Which in other generations was not made
known to the sons of men,
As it was now revealed to His holy apostles
and prophets in [the] Spirit.

"In other generations" might indeed be rendered "to other generations," were it not parallel to "now" in the next line, and had not "the making known" its indirect object in "to the sons of men." So the phrase must mean "in other generations," the form of the Greek words representing the dative of time, as in the "many times" of *Luke* viii. 29. Here, the apostle regards the Jewish dispensation as divided among generations. So, in the phrase, "the fulness of the seasons," *Eph.* i. 10, he distinguished it into seasons, or epochs. And now he carefully distinguishes them from his own generation as not merely "other" but as "different." They are not "others" of the same kind, *allais*, but "others" of a different kind, *hétérais*.

Although the phrase, "the sons of men," was coined by the Greek Vulgate to represent the Hebrew *b'nê 'ādhām*, "the sons of man" or "Adam," it is not found elsewhere in the Greek Testament, except in *Mark* iii. 28. Even in the latter case, the parallel passage in *Matthew* xii. 31, has simply "men." In *Eph.* iii. 5, as we see, the phrase is set against "the holy apostles and prophets," and evidently denotes the whole human race, as those "holy apostles and prophets" are "the apostles" and "the prophets" of the early Church. In the parallel passage of the *Epistle to the Colossians*, this is quite clear, for St. Paul there speaks of "the word of God, the mystery,"

Col. i. 26. The [Mystery] hidden away from the ages and from
the generations,
But [which] was now manifested to His holy [ones].

And the word "holy" in both these parallel passages plainly means "consecrated," "set apart" to God.

There is a slight difference, however, in the way, in which St. Paul presents the matter to the Ephesians. He says

the Mystery was not formerly made known, as it is now. The particle "as" suggests that there were obscure hints of it. So, at the Synod of Jerusalem, in the end of 49 A.D., St. James the Less, and cousin of our Lord, freely quoted the Greek Vulgate of *Amos* ix. 11, 12, telling how God would restore David's tabernacle,

Acts xv. 17. That the rest of men may seek after the Lord—
And all the nations, upon whom My Name is called.

At a later time, in the January of 57, St. Paul also will use the same version freely, in order to apply passages from *Hosea*, ii. 23, 1 (Hebrew), the younger and more lyrical contemporary of Amos, to the same purpose, saying,

Rom. ix. 25. I will call the "Not-My-People," "My People";
And the "not-beloved," beloved.

26. And it will be in the place, where it was said to them
"You are not my people"—

There, they will be called,
"Sons of [the] living God."

Now indeed, God's purpose has been made clear to all for ever. But how little that purpose was apprehended is evident in the difficulties, which arose, probably in 35 A.D., with regard to St. Peter's baptism of Cornelius, *Acts* x. xi. 1-18. The limitation of the outlook is also evident in the limitation of the preaching to Jews only, till some converted Jews from Cyprus and Cyrene addressed Greeks at Antioch, *Acts* xi. 19-26. Yet the wider view gave deeper meaning to our Lord's parable of the labourers in the vineyard, *Matt.* xx. 1-16, and that of the marriage feast, *Matt.* xxii. 7-10; and it was required by the command to make all the nations His disciples, *Matt.* xxviii. 19.

These passages are all peculiar to St. Matthew ; but St. Mark contains this direction to the eleven,

Mk. xvi. 15. Being gone into the world—all [of it]—
Proclaim the Gospel to all the creation.

Further, St. John remembers, and will record how our Lord said,

John x. 16. And I have other sheep,
Which are not of this fold.

And I must lead those ;
And they will hear My voice.

And there will become one flock—
One Shepherd.

Yet the training of Israelites had lasted for more than thirteen centuries, if the Exodus indeed took place on Thursday, the 27th March, 1335, B.C., as Mahler abundantly argues. In spite of all that was implied in the books of *Ruth* and *Jonah*, and in many a line of the " Law, Prophets and Writings," the selection of Israel and the legislation of Sinai were necessary to prepare Messiah's cradle in a fallen world ; and a clear revelation of Jehovah's purpose for the Gentiles would have rendered Judaism impossible. So, when the day came, it needed more than a revelation to enlighten even the apostles and prophets of the New Testament. It required a revelation " in [the] Spirit," in " [the] Spirit of wisdom and revelation." If we recognise the use of the word " Spirit " with the article to denote God the Holy Spirit Himself, and the use of the word without the article to indicate His power or grace, then we may say that it was necessary to give the apostles and prophets both a Divine revelation of the Divine secret and a Divine power to receive it.

Having shewn the relation of the Mystery to the Jewish Revelation, and so suggested his own relation to ancient Israel, St. Paul proceeds to define the Mystery itself, using strange words, for which we may employ others as strange. So the Mystery is

Eph. iii. 6. That the nations are compossessing
And concorporate
And comparticpant

Of [that is, in] the promise
In Christ Jesus
By means of the Gospel.

The promise, taken by itself, may indeed be understood of the promise, made to Abraham, that in him all the families of the earth should be blessed, *Gen.* xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxviii. 14, and that they should count themselves blessed in his seed, *Gen.* xxii. 18. As to that seed, it should become as the dust of the earth, *Gen.* xiii. 16, and the stars of heaven, *Gen.* xv. 5. It should have God for its God, and Canaan for its land, *Gen.* xvii. 7, 8. But the context and the whole argument would explain the promise of the Holy Spirit, Who is the promised, as this encyclical has already implied in the expression, "the Spirit of the promise," *Eph.* i. 13. This is confirmed by St. Paul's *Epistle to the Galatians*, which presents the promise to Abraham as fulfilled in the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Gal. iii. 14. In order that unto the nations,
The blessing of Abraham might be
In Christ Jesus—

In order that we [Jews and nations] might receive
The promise of the Spirit
By means of faith.

As the word "we" is parallel to "the nations," and "by means of faith" to "in Christ Jesus," so "the promise of the Spirit" corresponds to "the blessing of Abraham." Therefore, the prophecy of *Joel* ii. 29, the promise by our Lord, *John* xiv. 26, and St. Peter's speech at Pentecost, *Acts* ii. 33, are harmonised with the blessing of the world through Abraham.

The co-partnership of the Gentiles in the promise is in union with Christ Jesus, and is brought about by the Apostle's Gospel as instrumental cause. So he could write to the Corinthians six years ago,

1 Cor. iv. 15. For in Christ Jesus
By means of the Gospel,

I—I begot you.

But before considering the three words, which St. Paul employs to express that co-partnership, we may see how he has already expressed the matter in his *Epistle to the Colossians*. There we read how God wished to make known to His holy [ones],

Col. i. 27. What the wealth of the glory
Of this Mystery in the nations—

Which is Christ in you—
The hope of the glory.

That is to say, he would have them know the wealth of the glory, manifested by this Mystery, which has its scope and reference, its meaning and power, not in the Jewish people, but in the nations. For that Mystery, effective in the nations, is the presence of the Jewish Messiah in Gentile souls. The Messiah dwells in their hearts by means of faith, *Eph.* iii. 17, and becomes their ground of hope with regard to the glory of God.

Now, in this encyclical, St. Paul describes the Gentiles as compossessing the promise with the Jews. The Greek word, which we have rendered "com-possessing" is found once in Philo, here, and in *Rom.* viii. 17, in *Heb.* xi. 9 and 1 *Pet.* iii. 7. It is, therefore, found once in Philo, twice in St. Paul, and twice in writings dependent on St. Paul. It is generally translated "co-heirs," but unfortunately, for we have seen that the simple form of the verb means "to possess," and that not necessarily by inheritance, *Eph.* i. 14. The Greek word, which we represent by "concorporate," seems to have been coined by St. Paul for this passage, in which alone it is found. As to the third Greek word, rendered "com-participant," the cognate verb is found even in Xenophon and Plato, but this adjective is only found in Aristotle, this epistle, *Eph.* iii. 6, v. 7. and Josephus.

The Apostle closes his explanation of the Mystery with the word, "Gospel," "good news," "Evangel." This will suggest his own office in its regard, the new digression restoring the original theme of the parenthesis. At the same time, the lines will show the Apostle's relation to God, as the previous lines indicated his relation to Israel and the Gentiles. For the Gentiles are admitted to their privileges by means of the Gospel,

Eph. iii. 7. Of which I became minister according to the gift—

[Consisting] of the grace of God,

[Of the grace] which was given to me—

According to the activity of His power.

We may note that "the gift of the grace" means "the gift, consisting of the grace," the phrase illustrating the genitive of apposition, of which we have found other instances in this epistle, *Eph.* ii. 14, 15, vi. 14. And in

speaking of the grace of God, which was given him, St. Paul recalls the very same expression, which he used at the beginning of the parenthesis, *Eph.* iii. 2.

We note the repetition of the preposition, *katá*, "according to." St. Paul's vocation was according to God's gift. It was also according to the activity of God's power. Describing this second characteristic of his vocation, the words recall two lines in the *Epistle to the Colossians*. Having told of his aim to present every man perfect in Christ, St. Paul, there and then, added with respect to that aim,

Col. i. 29. Unto which also I toil,

Contending according to His activity,
Which is active in me in power.

Indeed, the thought is older still, for it is found in the epistle, written to the Galatians nearly twelve years ago, in 49 A.D., when St. Paul said,

Gal. ii. 8. For [He],—who was active for Peter
Unto [the fulfilment of his] apostolate [in regard] of
the Circumcision—

He was active for me also
Unto [the fulfilment of my apostolate in regard of]
the nations.

And having expounded the meaning of the Mystery, he will now unfold its purpose. First of all, he will restate his own office in regard to the evangelisation of the Gentiles and the revelation of the Mystery. He is mediator between the Mystery and the Gentiles, *Eph.* iii. 8, 9. Then he will unfold the purpose of the revelation. It is the manifestation of God's multifarious wisdom to the heavenly intelligences, *Eph.* iii. 10, 11. And finally, he will show the consequences of the revelation in regard to friendship with God and the sufferings of God's apostle, *Eph.* iii. 12, 13.

Eph. iii. 8, 9. The Purpose of St. Paul's Preaching.

Again the Apostle's pulse beats fast. The flood of thought and emotion swells. And we can almost see the bowed form gradually straighten, rise and stand. He has spoken of himself as minister of the Gospel by God's gift of grace and by God's exercise of power. And, as he has mentioned the gift,

Eph. iii. 7b. [Consisting] of the grace of God,
[Of the grace] which was given to me,

he proceeds to describe the "me" and to define the "grace." Therefore he says, first of all,

Eph. iii. 8. To me—the leaster than all holy [ones]—
Was given this grace.

And secondly, that grace was

Eph. iii. 8c. To evangelise the nations
[As to] the untraceable wealth of the Christ,

9. And to illumine what the stewardship
of the Mystery [is],
[Of the Mystery] which has been hidden
away from the ages

In God,
Who created all the things.

The Apostle has already pointed out to the Corinthians, that God chose the foolish, weak, low-born, despised and even non-existent to shame the wise and strong, 1 Cor. i, 27, 28. Yet St. Paul himself lacks nothing in comparison with the "super-exceeding" apostles, 2 Cor. xi. 5, even if he is nothing, 2 Cor. xii. 11. least of the apostles, 1 Cor. xv. 9, unworthy of the name, because he, as a blasphemer,

persecutor, outrageous person and first of sinners, 1 *Tim.* i. 13, 15, persecuted the Church of God, 1 *Cor.* xv. 9. God's grace is now manifested in him, as a treasure in an earthenware vessel; and so the victorious torches of Gideon's men were held in broken pitchers, *Judges* vii. 20, that the "excessiveness" of the power may be God's, 2 *Cor.* iv. 7.

To emphasise his own state, St. Paul speaks of himself now as not merely the least of the apostles, 1 *Cor.* xv. 9, but as "leaster" of all God's holy [ones], of all those set apart and consecrated in the new Israel. We find instances, in which a comparative receives another comparative ending, as "greaterer" in 3 *John* 4, and others, in which a superlative receives another superlative ending as "leastest" in *Sextus Empiricus*. But St. Paul adds a comparative ending to a superlative in forming the word "leaster." So Aristotle, in his *Metaphysics*, X. iv. 7, has already composed the word "laster," and the Greek papyrus, 134⁴⁹, of the British Museum, will in the first or second century A.D., show the form "greatester."

Describing himself as less than the least of the faithful, though he is one of them, the Apostle coins an expression, which is literally a paradox, and likely to offend prosaic and pedantic minds. But rhetorically, it is charged with powerful emphasis.

In the commencement of his seventh homily on this epistle, St. Chrysostom speaks of St. Paul's surpassing lowliness after so many great and noble deeds. We cannot modify the language of the Apostle. His sense of sin was beyond anything in our experience. Sin is defect; and it is unutterably terrible, when the sinful soul is also defective in consciousness of its own defect in grace, intellect and will. When God's grace awakens the soul to consciousness, the fuller the correspondence between the grace and the

soul, the deeper is the soul's sense of sin, its consciousness of worthlessness. In St. Paul's language, there is no exaggeration. Its strained and broken form shows how it fails to express the full reality, and is incommensurate with St. Paul's experience.

Then he speaks of the grace. It is not sanctifying grace, to endow him with supernatural life and make him pleasing to God. But it is a grace, freely given for the sake of others,

Eph. iii. 8. To evangelise the nations

[As to] the untraceable wealth of the Christ,

9. And to illumine what the stewardship of the
Mystery [is],

[Of the Mystery] which has been hidden away
from the ages,

In God,

Who created all the things.

In the parallel passage of the *Epistle to the Colossians*, we read how St. Paul became a minister of the Church,

Col. i. 25. According to the stewardship of God,
Which was given me unto you.

This was to fill and complete the word of God,

Col. i. 26. [The Mystery], which has been hidden away from the
ages

And from the generations,

But now is manifested to His holy [ones],

27. To whom God willed to make known

What [is] the wealth of the glory
Of this mystery in the nations,

Which is Christ in you,
The hope of the glory.

Comparing these passages, we see how the parallels, "evangelise" and "illumine," in *Eph.* iii. 8, 9, correspond to the parallels, "manifested" and "willed to make known," in *Col.* i. 26, 27. The description of the Mystery as that,

Which has been hidden away from the ages,

is identical in *Eph.* iii. 9, and *Col.* i. 26. "The wealth of the glory of this Mystery," defined as "Christ in you" in *Col.* i. 27, becomes "the untraceable wealth of the Christ" in *Eph.* iii. 8. So we argue that "the stewardship of God" in *Col.* i. 25, is the same as "the stewardship of the mystery," in *Eph.* iii. 9. It is God's stewardship, His management and administration of the whole cosmic process in all its departments, whether that stewardship be delegated to the Christ, *Eph.* i. 10, or entrusted in respect of one particular to St. Paul, *Col.* i. 25.

With regard to the words of this passage, *Eph.* iii. 8, 9, the verb "evangelise" refers to the noun, "Evangel" or "Gospel," *Eph.* iii. 6, by which St. Paul, its minister, admitted the nations to share the Messianic promise, *Eph.* iii. 7. "Untraceable" means literally "untrackable by footprints," and has already been used of God's ways in *Rom.* xi. 33. The translator of *Job* for the Greek Vulgate had used the word in v. 9, ix. 10, and xxxiv. 24, in regard to what is wonderful or great beyond investigation. Most probably, he provided St. Paul with the word. The word for "illumine" will be used later of our Lord's illumining life and immortality, *2 Tim.* i. 10. It has already been used of His illumining the hidden things of the darkness, *1 Cor.* iv. 5, the word being parallel to "manifest." It is now employed of St. Paul's illumining the meaning, essence, and nature of the stewardship.

Unfortunately, some were probably led by

John i. 9. He was the Light, the true [Light],
Which illumines every man,

and by *Judges*, xiii. 8, 2 *Kings*, xii. 2, xvii, 27, 28, in the Greek Vulgate, to interpret the word as "instruct." They found the instructed persons by inserting the word "all," and presenting the expression as

Eph. iii. 9. And to illumine all [as to] what [is] the stewardship
of the mystery,

though St. Paul would hardly claim that universal office for himself.

The expression "from the ages" is found only here and in the parallel passage, *Col.* i. 26. Like the similar expression, "from [the] age," in *Luke* i. 70, *Acts* iii. 21, and xv. 18, it means from the beginning of time. And in this connection, we may recall

1 Cor. ii. 7. But we speak God's wisdom in a *Mystery*—
The [wisdom] *hidden away*,

Which God pre-determined *before the ages*
Unto our glory.

And another significant passage mentions the preaching of Jesus Christ,

Rom. xvi. 25. According to revelation of [the] *Mystery*,
As to which silence has been kept in the aeonian
time [or, the times of the ages].

There is much significance in the description of the *Mystery*, as having been hidden

Eph. iii. 9c. In God,
Who created all the things.

For in its doctrine of creation, Judaism was implicitly a universal religion, the doctrine of selection being supplemented by the doctrine of God's originating all things, and therefore possessing ultimate dominion over them. It is held by most theologians, that the human mind could discover this doctrine of creation ; but there remains the fact that it never did so. The Hebrew *Genesis* distinguishes between the creation of heaven and earth, and their formation. On the other hand, there is no creation in the Babylonian cosmogony, as for example in the *Enuma elish* poem, copied about the seventh century B.C., but possibly representing originals, composed about 2100 B.C., that is, in the time of Abraham and Hammurabi. These originals, it is alleged, represent a still older Creation myth. In the poem, as we have it, everything, even the very gods, are formed out of an original chaos, Tiâmat, the " Sea " or the Deep, the personified and deified estuary of the Euphrates. So we read,

When above, heaven was not named ;
And the earth below had no name,

And the primæval Apsu, who begot them,—
And chaos, Ti'âmat, the mother of them both,—

Their waters were mingled together :
No trees embraced ; no rose-tree grew.

When none of the gods had appeared :
No name was named ; no fate fixed.

The gods were formed :
The god Lakhmu and the god Lakhamu appeared.

The earliest philosophers, some of whom Aristotle discusses in his *Metaphysics* I. iii., began in the same fashion. Explaining the world by a material cause, Thales of Miletus, who lived between 640 and 548 B.C., derived everything

from water. He taught at the time, when Jeremiah in Jerusalem and Ezekiel at Tel-abib in Babylonia were bewailing the Chaldean destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. His younger contemporary, another Milesian, Anaximander, who lived between 610 and 547, evolved everything from something, which he called the "Indefinite." It was matter without any qualities, but containing the seeds of all things. Anaximenes of Miletus died at the capture of Sardis, either that by Cyrus in 546, or that by the Greeks in 500. He, probably a younger contemporary of Thales and Anaximander, referred all things to air as their origin. The Ephesian Heraclitus, "the Dark," whose tearful mood and obscure style increased the world's burden about 504 B.C., traced everything to fire. Such was philosophic speculation in its origin. Even after it had run its course for eighteen centuries, the Fourth Council of Lateran, in 1215, was obliged to assert and define the doctrine of Creation; and St. Thomas Aquinas, who died on his way to the Council of Lyons in 1274, found it necessary to defend it strenuously in his *Summa Theologica* I. xlvi., and his treatise *Contra Gentiles* II. xxx-xxxviii. And in our own day, the ignoring or the implying of creation is generally an index to the character of a book, and tells whether it is written from the standpoint of some popular philosophy, or from that of a larger and deeper theology.

The idea of creation becomes richer in associations, when we note that it is connected in *Col.* i. 16, 20, with the new and supernatural creation. For God, who created all things in Jesus the Christ at the beginning, *Col.* i. 16, would now reconcile all things to Himself by means of Him. So the preaching of the Gospel in the cities of the nations becomes more than worldwide, even cosmic in its reference; and the Pauline philosophy of history becomes a philosophy of the universe.

Eph. iii. 8, 9. Disputed Readings: "in," "all," "by means of Jesus Christ."

In the passage, we have just examined, three glosses have been interpolated in the Greek text. The preposition *en*, "in," has been borrowed from the parallel passage, *Col.* i. 27, and inserted in *Eph.* iii. 8c, before "the nations." The word, "all," as we have seen, has been inserted in *Eph.* iii. 9a, to provide a personal object for the verb "illumine," read as meaning "instruct." And at the end of *Eph.* iii. 9, the lines,

In God,
Who created all the things,

are increased by the phrase "by means of Jesus Christ."

We need not hesitate to reject the three variants as glosses and interpolations. But that security of the conclusions gives additional interest to the names of the witnesses on both sides. For, as a sure witness gives us a clue to the character of a reading, so a sure reading gives us a clue to the character of a witness.

As to the preposition, *en*, "in," it is inserted by Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., its copy, the Sangerman E, of Cent ix., and the twin uncials, the Augien F and the Boernerian G, of Cent. ix. To this Western testimony, we must add the Old Latin, the Latin Vulgate of 385 and the Gothic, made after 341 and affected by the Old Latin after 568. With these, we naturally have St. Hilary, about 354 A.D. in *Ps.* ix. 3, Vienna edition, p. 76, Victorinus of Rome about 360, Ambrosiaster of Rome under Pope Dámasus, 366-384, and St. Jerome's commentary of 388. The word is found in the Pěshittā Syriac of 411, and in the Harclean Syriac of 616. Probably, they represent the Old Syriac in this, as the preposition is found in the Armenian version, which contains some Old Syriac readings. On the same

side, we have the *Dialogue against the Marcionites*, p. 870, written about 300, and falsely attributed to Origen; and there is Didymus of Alexandria, whose life was almost coeval with the fourth century, his testimony being found in his work *on the Trinity* p. 197. There is the Alexandrian Cyril, in his work of 430 A.D. *on the Right Faith*, p. 123 in Aubert's edition of 1638. Then there is the Syrian or Antiochian group, including St. Chrysostom before 398, Theodoret about 423, Damascene about 717, and the ninth century uncials, the Moscovian K and the Angelic L. Finally, there are the cursives, 17, of Cent. ix. or x., 47, of Cent. xi., and 37, of Cent. xv.

There is quantity in favour of the word; but it is opposed by quality. For it is omitted in the Sinaitic Aleph and Vatican B of 331, in the Alexandrian A and the Ephraem C, of Cent. v., and in the Porphyrian P, of Cent. ix. It is not found in the Bohairic Egyptian, of 200 or 250, or in Euthalius, the Alexandrian deacon of 458, or in the Ethiopic of 600. And it is opposed by the Syrian text in the Greek cursives, 23 and 31, of Cent. xi., 221, of Cent. xii., and 61.

In the second case, we find "all" inserted by the Western Text of Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi, its copy, the Sangerman E, of Cent. ix., and the twin uncials, the Augien F and the Boernerian G, of Cent. ix. To these, we add the Western Text of the Old Latin, of the work *against Marcion*, V. xviii. written by Tertullian, about 208 A.D., of Victorinus, about 360, of Ambrosiaster under Pope Damasus, 366-384, and of the Latin Vulgate in 385. The fourth century writer, Didymus, in his work *on the Trinity*, p. 197, and the deacon Euthalius, in 458, both represent Alexandria and the word "all." To these, we must add the Ephraem palimpsest C, of Cent. v., and the *Dialogue against the Marcionites*, p. 870, written about 300, and wrongly attri-

buted to Origen. Of Syrian authorities, we have St. Chrysostom, and the ninth century uncials, the Moscovian K and the Angelic L. On the same side, we find the seventh century corrector of the Sinaitic Aleph, \aleph^c , the Porphyrian P, of Cent. ix., and strange to say, the Vatican B, probably of 331. The last witness sometimes indeed shows Western influence ; and to some such cause, we may attribute its accord in this case with the Western group.

The word "all" is omitted by the Sinaitic Aleph, of 331, by the Alexandrian A, of Cent. V., and by St. Jerome's commentary, pp. 593, 594, of 388, which most probably, as in so much, represents the views of Origen, who became head of the Alexandrian School in 203. The word is also omitted by the Alexandrian Cyril, in 430 A.D., in his work *on the Right Faith*, p. 123 in Aubert's edition ; and by the second corrector of the eleventh century cursive, 67. It is not found in St. Hilary, who became bishop of Poitiers in 354, and quotes the verse in his comment on *Ps. ix. 3*, p. 76 of the Vienna edition. And equally significant is its omission by St. Augustine about 390 A.D., in his work on the literal interpretation of *Genesis*, V. xxxviii., p. 162 in the Vienna edition.

In the third case, a scribe has added the phrase "by means of Jesus Christ." It seems as if this was read in his text by Victorinus about 360. If so, it is the earliest occurrence of the gloss. It is then found in St. Chrysostom, p. 53, before 398, and therefore in his followers, Theodoret about 423, Œcumenius about 600, Damascene about 717, and Theophylact about 1077. It is found in the Harclean Syriac of 616 ; and then in four witnesses, belonging to the ninth century, the second corrector of Claromontanus D, the Sangerman E, and the Syrian texts of the Moscovian K and the Angelic L.

But the contrary evidence is overwhelming in quantity

and quality. It is excluded from the Western Text, represented by Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., the twins, the Augien F and the Boernerian G, of Cent. ix., the Old Latin versions in those three manuscripts, and those in the *Speculum*, or "Mirror," p. 69, of Cent. viii. or ix., and the Sangerman e of Cent. ix., the Latin Vulgate of 385, which is only a modified form of the Old Latin, so far as the Pauline Epistles are concerned, Tertullian, in his work *against Marcion*, V. xviii., about 208 A.D., Ambrosiaster under Pope Dámasus, 366-384 A.D., St. Augustine in his work about 390 A.D., on the literal interpretation of *Genesis* V. xxxviii., p. 162 in the Vienna edition, and the Gothic Version, made after 341, but affected by the Old Latin, when it reached Italy in the Lombards' invasion of 568.

Alexandria and Cæsarea are equally emphatic in rejecting the words as a gloss. Notwithstanding his Latin Vulgate of 385, St. Jerome omits the words in his commentary of 388, this being greatly dependent on Origen. We may therefore suppose with great probability that the words were omitted by Origen, who became head of the Alexandrian School in 203, and founded the Caesarean School in 231. They are not found in the Sinaitic Aleph or the Vatican B, both probably of Caesarea and the year 331; nor do they occur in the Alexandrian A or the Ephraem C, of Cent. v. They are not in the Bohairic version of Northern Egypt, made about 200 or 250; nor in the *Dialogue against the Marcionites*, composed about 300, and wrongly attributed to Origen; nor in the work *on the Trinity*, p. 197, by the Alexandrian Didymus, who lived between 309 and 394, or between 314 and 399; nor in the work of 430 A.D., *on the Right Faith*, p. 123 in Aubert's 1638 edition, by the Alexandrian Cyril; nor in the Alexandrian deacon, Euthalius, in 458. To this list, we may add the uncial Porphyrian P, of Cent. ix., the cursive 17, of Cent. ix. or x.,

and as a Neo-Alexandrian, St. Basil, iii. 9, who was consecrated for Cappadocian Caesarea in 370.

The gloss is not found in the Armenian version, made after 431, nor in the Ethiopic of 600, or the Harclean Syriac of 616, or the Schaafrican Syriac of 1708. It is also excluded from the three eleventh century cursives, 47, 48 and 73.

Eph. iii. 10, 11. The Purpose of the Revelation.

It was indeed the purpose of St. Paul's ministry to proclaim the revelation of the mystery to the nations. But that revelation itself had a vaster purpose. The untraceable wealth of the Messiah and His stewardship of the mystery, hidden from the beginning in the Creator, are now to be made known,

**Eph. iii. 10. In order that might be made known now—
To the principedoms and the authorities in
the heavenlies—
—by means of the Church,
The multifarious wisdom of God.**

To find the arrangement of this verse, we must first note the parallel lines,

In order that might be made known now by means
of the Church
The multifarious wisdom of God.

In this, St. Paul would interpolate the persons, to whom the wisdom is to be made known. Therefore, he inserts,

To the principedoms and the authorities in the heavenlies.

But he does so in the middle of the first line.

This interpretation is confirmed by the similar passage in

Eph. ii. 7. In order that He might exhibit in the ages, the [ages]
coming upon [us],

The exceeding wealth of His grace.

The first line there corresponds to the first line here,

Eph. iii. 10. In order that might be made known now by means
of the Church.

And the second line there as to

The exceeding wealth of His grace,

corresponds to

Eph. iii. 10. The multifarious wisdom of God

in the present passage. The persons to be instructed were omitted in the former case ; but they are interpolated, as we see, in the latter.

Those persons are angelic intelligences, and include both good and bad angels, according to the view of St. Chrysostom, and according to the evidence, to be given in *Eph.* vi. 12, as to spiritual [hosts] of evil in the heavenlies. The term, " watcher," or rather " wakeful one," used of angels in *Daniel* iv. 13, 17, 23, is used in the *Book of Enoch*, of both good angels, xii. 3, xx. 1, and fallen ones, i. 5, x. 9, 15, xii. 4, xiii. 10, and other places. And it will be noticed that those instances occur in the section, cc. 1-xxxvi., written a little after 170 B.C. It would seem, however, that St. Paul denotes good angels only, when he argues that a woman ought to have [a sign of] authority on her head, because of the angels, 1 *Cor.* xi. 10. But no distinction is suggested, when he describes the apostles as a spectacle to the world and angels and men, 1 *Cor.* iv. 9. Nor does St. Peter, in his comment on this passage of the

Epistle to the Ephesians iii. 10, limit it to good angels. He is speaking of those things,

1 Pet. i. 12. Which were now announced to you—
By means of those who evangelised you
In [the] Holy Spirit, sent from heaven—
Into which angels desire to peep.

Those angels had seen Creation, Providence, Judgement and the Incarnation. Now, by means of the Church, they would see a more multiform web of Divine operations. But the reference is to the Catholic Church, for no local church is mentioned in this encyclical, except in its superscription, *Eph.* i. 1. It is more than a blending of Greek thought, Roman law, Indian mysticism, Teutonic enterprise, Celtic chivalry and Chinese patience, that is in question. It is not the multifarious constituents of the Church, but the multifarious wisdom of God. Only here in the Greek Testament, do we find the word for "multifarious" or "much-variegated." St. Peter indeed speaks of the variegated, varied or various grace of God, 1 Pet. iv. 10, but not as much-variegated. Further, it is true beyond question that the Messiah, the Christ, is God's wisdom as well as God's power, 1 Cor. i. 24, 30. But here, we are not contemplating God's wisdom as treasured and active in, or as proceeding from the Messiah, but as illustrated by the historical map of the Universe.

St. Paul is referring to the multifarious wisdom of God,

Eph. iii. 11. According to purpose—of the ages—
Which He made [or realised] in the
Christ, Jesus the Lord of us.

That is to say, it is according to purpose, deliberately, in view of a plan, as in *Eph.* i. 9, 11. And this is a plan or purpose, which ran through the whole course of the ages.

As Jehovah is a rock of ages, an everlasting rock, *Isaiah* xxvi. 4, so His purpose is a purpose of ages, an everlasting purpose. And this purpose, which harmonised all the tones of Creation, and twined all the threads of being into one cosmic cord, was realised in the Christ, now raised, and enthroned as Centre and Sovereign of the Universe. Therefore, His full title is given here and in *Col.* ii. 6. He is the Messiah, the Christ, to whom all things from the creation pointed; and He is the Lord, as Sovereign over death and all things. Here, we include the static and mechanical aspect of the Universe, the dynamical and historical account of its process, and its contents in the matter and force of the physicist, the vegetal and animal life of the biologist, the consciousness and self-consciousness of the psychologist. But the Pauline outlook includes the supernatural order as well as the natural; and the Pauline perspective sees all things in both orders in their due relation to each other and the Christ.

Five years hence, in the summer of 66 A.D., and writing from his Roman prison, St. Paul will sum up much of what he has just said in this encyclical. And the passage would now prepare us for what he is about to say. Indeed, as the best transition from the present section, *Eph.* iii. 10, 11, on the "Purpose of the Revelation," to the next, in which we must discuss the "Consequences of the Revelation," we may read these words,

- 2 Tim. i. 8. Therefore, be not ashamed of the witness of our Lord,
Nor even of me, His prisoner.

But suffer-evil-with the Gospel,
According to God's power,

9. Who delivered us,
And called [us] with holy calling—

Not according to our works,
But according to His own purpose,

And [according to His] grace, which was given us
In Christ Jesus,

Before æonian times,
10. But manifested now

By means of the appearing of our Saviour,
Christ Jesus,

[Who] indeed rendered death idle,
But illumined life and immortality

By means of the Gospel,
11. Unto which I was appointed herald

And Apostle
And teacher.

Then follow the tones, with which our next section will
ring.

2 Tim. i. 12. On account of which cause,
I also suffer these things ;

But I am not ashamed,
For I know whom I have believed ;

And I am persuaded that He is able
To guard my deposit

Unto that Day.

Eph. iii. 12, 13. The Consequences of the Revelation.

In the last verse of the passage from the *Second Epistle to St. Timothy*, 2 Tim. i. 12, are blended St. Paul's sufferings and St. Paul's confidence. Both these are found in the next section of our encyclical, *Eph. iii. 12, 13*, where they are made the basis of an appeal for a confident spirit in the readers.

The purpose of God, realised in the Messiah, now manifests the Divine Wisdom to heavenly intelligences by means

of the Catholic Church, the Mystical Body of the Messiah. But just as His Human Body never was a human body apart from Him, so Messiah's Mystical Body became such in Him. Therefore, believing in Him, our spirit grows confident, and we enter to God with freedom and introduction from the Messiah Himself,

Eph. iii. 12. In Whom we have the boldness and introduction

In confidence by means of the faith in Him.

In union with Christ, and bundled in the bundle of life with Him, 1 *Sam.* xxv. 29, we have the boldness and introduction. These two words are united closely under the one article, which also indicates both as well-known and already experienced. There is no need to pause on the inadequate evidence for a second article before the word for "introduction." The appropriateness of the single article will be evident, when we note that the two words "boldness" and "introduction" represent the active and passive modes of our approach to God. We have boldness, the word *par-rhesia*, that is *pan-rhesia*, implying first of all "all-flowing" speech, or fluency; then, freedom or plainness of speech, as in *John* xvi. 25, 29; next, boldness before men, as in 1 *Macc.* iv. 18, *Wisdom* v. 1, the *Testaments of the xii. Patriarchs*, "Reuben" iv., *Phil.* i. 20, 1 *Tim.* iii. 13, and the *Antiquities* of Josephus IX. x. 4; and finally, by a fine and daring figure, of boldness before God. This last sense of the word is found in St. Paul on this occasion alone, *Eph.* iii. 12, though it occurs in *Heb.* iii. 6, iv. 16, x. 19, 35, 1 *John* ii. 28, iii. 21, iv. 17, v. 14.

It has been asserted with great confidence that we cannot here translate *prōs-ägōgē* as "introduction," and must therefore render it by "access" or "right of approach."

But the transitive sense "introduction" completes the picture of our boldness by Messiah's leading. That sense is confirmed by the more frequent use of the word in Attic Greek, still more by St. Chrysostom's comment on *Eph.* ii. 18, and most of all by St. Peter's comment,

1 Pet. iii. 18. Because Christ also once
Died concerning sins—

A Just [One] on behalf of unjust [ones].—
In order that He might introduce you to God.

This fourth line is an explanation of the "introduction" in *Eph.* iii. 12. The Messiah, the Christ, is indeed the door of the sheepfold, *John* x. 7, 9, the shepherd lying across the entrance as the gate in some Palestinian sheepfolds. But He is also the Way to the Father, *John* xiv. 6., and not merely a passive road, but one which implies the Father's drawing, *John* vi. 44, and the Son's leading, *John* x. 3.

The word, which we have rendered "confidence" means "confident persuasion," and is found only once in the Greek Vulgate, 2 *Kings* xviii. 19; but it is used by Philo. It is in some measure characteristic of St. Paul, as he alone of New Testament writers employs it. In his epistles it occurs six times, 2 *Cor.* i. 15, iii. 4, viii. 22, x. 2, *Eph.* iii. 12, *Phil.* iii. 4. Afterwards, it is found in Josephus, and still later in Sextus Empiricus towards the end of the second century, A.D.

We have the boldness and introduction, not only with confidence, but also "by means of the faith in Him." As to the last phrase, it is literally "by means of the faith of Him;" "faith of Him" being equivalent to "faith in Him," according to similar constructions in *Mark* xi. 22, *Gal.* ii. 16, iii. 22, *Rom.* iii. 22, 26, and *Phil.* iii. 9. In the present case, the word for "faith" has the article, but, like the article

before "boldness and introduction," it serves to indicate the faith as that already known and experienced.

Such confidence is one consequence of the revelation. It will sustain men under the other. This consists of the sufferings, which are inevitable in such cases. A new message from God will always irritate a world that loves not new ways. And a fresh enterprise by men of God will always receive persecution from dupes of Satan.

But, first of all, the Apostle argues from the confident boldness and introduction, which we have in Christ by faith.

Eph. iii. 13. Wherefore, I ask for myself not to faint
In my afflictions on behalf of you—

Which is your glory.

The first line is ambiguous, for "not to faint" may mean "that I do not faint," or "that you do not faint." The latter is much the more probable, as the prayer, which follows in the next section, asks or petitions, that the readers may be strengthened with power in the inward man. And the phrases, "on behalf of you," and "your glory," suggest motives for those readers.

Besides the question, whether it is for him or for them not to faint, there is the question whether the petition is to them or to God, or more indefinitely, an expression of desire. The verb is used in the active voice of the Jews, who are asking signs, 1 *Cor.* i. 22. But in two of the three places, in which St. Paul uses the verb in the middle or reflexive voice, it undoubtedly implies prayer to God, *Col.* i. 9, *Eph.* iii. 20. Therefore, such a meaning is most probable in the third and present case, *Eph.* iii. 13. This probability is raised into a certainty by the context; for this petition recalls the effort, already made by the

Apostle, to begin a prayer, and so closes the long parenthesis, *Eph.* iii. 1-13.

The last line, emphatic in its solitary position, commences with a relative pronoun, implying "which is of such a character." This is attracted by the word "glory" into the singular from the plural of its antecedent, "afflictions." We may now render the passage,

**Eph. iii. 13. Wherefore, I petition for myself that you
do not faint
In [consequence of] my afflictions on behalf
of you—**

**Which [affliction] is [such that it] is your
glory.**

Both their privileges and St. Paul's afflictions measure God's love toward them. As to the word "faint," "be cowardly," or "lose heart," it is used by St. Paul in *Gal.* vi. 9, 2 *Thess.* iii. 13, 2 *Cor.* iv. 1, 16, and *Eph.* iii. 13. Among other New Testament writers, it is used once, and only once, by St. Paul's companion, St. Luke xviii. 1. So this word also is characteristic of St. Paul. Though he was the bravest of the brave—perhaps, in life's irony, because he was so—there were moments, when that great heart, harassed by pain and fretted by worry, sank, till it was revived by a letter, or friends, 2 *Cor.* ii. 13, *Acts* xxviii. 15.

But in the present mention of his sufferings, we see how the Apostle regarded them as symbols of a failure, only apparent, and of a defeat, quite unreal. They were truly evidence of what he thought worth while to suffer for the end in view. They were really evidence of what God was willing to suffer in His servant for the cause. As Saul had persecuted, not the faithful of Jesus, but Jesus

Himself, *Acts* ix. 5, so the sufferings of Paul were the sufferings of Jesus. Therefore, the Apostle could write to the Colossians,

Col. i. 24. Now I rejoice in the sufferings on behalf of you,
And supplement on my part the deficits

Of the afflictions of the Christ
In my flesh,

On behalf of His Body,
Which is the Church.

Similarly, he had written to the Corinthians,

2 Cor. i. 5. Because, according as the sufferings of the Christ
overflow unto us,
So our consolation also, by means of the Christ
overflows.

Eph. iii. 14-19. The Second Prayer.

The first prayer summed up *Eph.* i. 2-14. The second prayer was to sum up the second chapter. In that case, it would have dealt with the reconciliation of the Gentiles on the same basis as that of the Jews. But we saw that St. Paul broke off at the very commencement of his prayer to speak of his own ministry in regard to that Mystery. Then he went on to tell how such a course of events bore its fruit in the very heavenlies. So the second prayer has now a theme conterminous with created being. And as the first prayer spoke of God and knowledge and a Spirit of wisdom and revelation, so the second prayer speaks of the Father and love and a Spirit of power.

In this prayer, St. Paul asks for his readers that they may be made mighty, and be indwelt by the Christ. He would save them know Messiah's love, so that they may be filled

to the measure of God. He now resumes the two words, already used, *Eph.* iii. 1; and he would say,

Eph. iii. 14. For sake of this—I bend my knees toward the
Father,
In order that He may give you,—

But the name “Father,” *patēr*, suggests a play on the word. So he introduces the word, “family,” *patriá*. This may be used of a race, *Herodotus* i. 200, or tribe, *Ps.* xxii. 28 (Heb.), or kindred, *Luke* ii. 4. It is used of all the angels in a later Rabbinic comment on *Jeremiah* xxx. 6, “all faces” being explained as “the faces of the upper and the lower family; of the angels and of Israel.” In the present passage, it includes a reference to the angels, but in those classes, of which the Apostle has already spoken, *Eph.* i. 21. The play on the words is lost in English; though some, imitating the Syriac renderings in the Peshitta, or Syriac Vulgate, and in Aphrahat, *Wright*, p. 472, and the Latin renderings in the Latin Vulgate and St. Jerome, have tried to retain it by substituting “fatherhood,” *pátrotēs*, for “family.”

Between those two lines, the Apostle will therefore insert the couplet,

Eph. iii. 15. Out of Whom every family in [the] heavens
And on earth is being named.

So now the lines run,

Eph. iii. 14. For sake of this, I bend my knees toward
the Father—

15. Out of whom every family in [the] heavens
And on earth is being named—

16. In order that He may give you—
According to the wealth of His glory—

This last line, like the interjected couplet, is added parenthetically ; but, as we have seen in discussing *Eph.* i. 18d, the phrase, " the wealth of His glory," is repeated from the first prayer, and should be understood in the light of the two triplets, which will follow now.

If St. Paul had meant, that he bent his knees literally, he would probably have used the dative form, " to the Father," as in his quotations in *Rom.* xi. 4, xiv. 11. It is hardly probable that the Apostle, when dictating, fell on his knees, his head touching the ground, in accordance with the Eastern custom, illustrated by *Matthew* xxvi. 39, and its parallels, *Mark* xiv. 35, and *Luke* xxii. 41. Standing was the usual attitude in praying, *Matt.* vi. 5, *Mark* xi. 25, *Luke* xviii. 11, 13. Yet to express deeper emotions, men knelt, as Solomon, 1 *Kings* viii. 54, Daniel, vi. 10, St. Stephen, *Acts* vii. 60, and St. Paul himself at Miletus, *Acts* xx. 36, and at Tyre, *Acts* xxi. 5. This latter position became characteristic of Christians, as Eusebius notes in his account of the rain and thunderstorm, which, in 174 A.D., repelled the Quadi, and refreshed the Romans under Marcus Aurelius. He tells in his *History* V. v., how the soldiers of the Melitine legion, when they were in line of battle against the enemy, acted in a faith, which continued to his own time. They knelt, said he, on the earth, according to our peculiar custom of praying, and turned to make supplications unto God.

But St. Paul seems to have a deeper meaning in his use of the expression, " bend the knee." Now it is found only in *Isaiah* xlv. 23, and 1 *Chronicles* xxix. 20, of the Greek Vulgate, and in *Romans* xi. 4, xiv. 11, *Ephesians* iii. 14, and *Philippians* ii. 10, of the Greek Testament. In our present passage, St. Paul does not refer to 1 *Chronicles* xxix. 20 ; but he quotes *Isaiah* xlv. 23, in *Romans* xiv. 11, and applies it to our Lord in *Phil.* ii. 10. He uses the phrase, " bend

the knee," quoting 1 *Kings* xix. 18, in *Rom.* xi. 4, though the expression is not found in the Greek Vulgate of the passage. Evidently, then, the words were connected in St. Paul's mind with the Isaian passage, xlv. 23, which he quotes in *Rom.* xiv. 11, in a free citation of the Greek Vulgate,

[I swear as] I live,
Says [the] Lord,

That every knee shall bend to Me,
And every tongue shall give praise to God.

After the word, "Father," the Common, or Received Greek Text adds "of our Lord Jesus Christ." In another section, we can prove the phrase an interpolation. For the present, it is sufficient to point out that it interrupts the connection between the word "Father," and the clause "out of Whom every family is being named." We have found it possible to interpret "every family" of social groups on earth and angelic classes in heaven. St. Jerome would make the picture more definite than perhaps the Apostle intended it to be. For he would identify the archangels with the fathers of the heavenly families.

Under the Old Dispensation, and through the first of the Writing Prophets, *Amos* iii. 2, between 760 and 750 B.C., God said to Israel,

Only you have I known
Out of all the families of the ground.

Now the Apostle, led by the universalism in the doctrine of creation, *Eph.* iii. 9, looks out upon the whole world; and playing on the word "Father," *patēr*, indicates the relation of all men to God, by the verbal connection between *patēr*, "father," and *patriá*, "family." But his outlook

has been inclusive of heaven, so he extends the word *patriá*, "family," to include all orders of angels.

Every family, under its Greek name, "patria," receives that name by derivation "out of" the Father's name. The "out of" indicates the source of the name alone, not that of being. Other examples may be found in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* IV. v. 12, and in the well-known line of Sophocles' *Œdipus the King*. The messenger reminds the king that he was named Œdipus, or "Swollen-footed," from the state in which his infant feet were found,

1036 So that thou, who art [Œdipus], wast named "out of"
this misfortune.

St. Paul does not present the line as an argument, but rather as an illustration. St. Athanasius, therefore, reads too much into the text, when he quotes it in his *Orations against the Arians* i. 23, probably composed in 358. He interprets it as meaning that men are called fathers of their own children on account of God, who is supremely and alone truly Father of His own Son. It is a similar over-statement by Severian of Gabala, who acted as deputy for St. John Chrysostom in Constantinople in 401, when he says, according to Cramer's *Caténæ*, of 1842, vi. 159, that the name "Father" came to us from above. And for the exegesis of the text, it is quite irrelevant to introduce the argument of St. Thomas Aquinas, *Contra Gentiles* iii. 66, by which he proves that God as Father is the cause of men as fathers, God being essentially Father, and all other fathers becoming so by participating in that Divine power.

All that, no doubt, is excellent, and of great homiletic value. But, as a matter of fact, the clause is suggested parenthetically by the word "Father," and can hardly be more than a hint that the relation of all intelligent

creatures to God may be compared in some way to the relation of the word *patriá*, "family," to the word *patēr*, "father."

Then the Apostle resumes the purpose, for which he had figuratively bent his knees. He asks God to give the readers both strength and the indwelling of Christ. This was to be, not according to the Apostle's fervour in asking, or even according to their own deep need, but according to the wealth of God's glory, and therefore immeasurably.

We dealt with the phrase, "the wealth of the glory," in our explanation of *Eph.* i. 18d. And at the same time, we showed that the next words in our present passage, *Eph.* iii. 16c, 17, fall into two balanced triplets. St. Paul prays for his readers

**Eph. iii. 16c. To be made mighty with power
By means of His Spirit
[Sent] into the inward man—**

**17. The Christ to dwell
By means of faith
In your hearts in love.**

If we compare the two triplets, we may see that "to be made mighty" is answered by "the Christ to dwell"; "with power," by "in love"; "by means of His Spirit," by "by means of faith"; and "[sent] into the inward man," by "in your hearts."

St. Paul had prayed the first time that they might know the wealth of the glory,

**Eph. i. 19. And what the exceeding greatness
Of His power unto us—who believe—**

He prays, this second time, that they may be made mighty with that power. And this prayer is also a positive

supplication, corresponding to the negative one, that they should not faint, *Eph.* iii. 13.

In the prayer, which he has already uttered for the Colossian church, he has asked knowledge for his readers, as in the first Ephesian prayer ; and now he would also, as in the second, have them,

Col. i. 11. Empowered with every power,
According to the might of His glory,

Unto every endurance
And longsuffering with joy.

The parallelism of " with power," *Eph.* iii. 16c, and " in love," *Eph.* iii. 17c, confirms our judgement in regarding the phrase " in love " as concluding verse 17, and not as commencing verse 18. We are also supported by the use of that expression in this encyclical, iii. 17, iv. 2, 15, 16, v. 2, to describe the state of love among Christians, or to close a rhythm on an emphatic note, i. 4, iv. 2, 16.

The subjective, " by means of faith," corresponds to the objective, " by means of His Spirit," the two representing man's co-operation and God's grace. And the lines pass from the indwelling of the Holy Spirit to that of the Christ, just as the *Epistle to the Romans* viii., in January 57, more than four years earlier, had passed from the conditional clause of verse 9, " if indeed God's Spirit dwells in you," to the conditional clause of the next verse, " But if Christ [is] in you." Of course, in these passages, there is no reference to the way, in which the whole Church is the dwelling-place of God, as in ii. 22, of the present encyclical, but to the way, in which the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit make their abode in the individual Christian, *John* xiv. 17, 23. As the encyclical has presented both the Christian in the Christ, *Eph.* ii. 6, and the Christ in the

Christian, *Eph.* iii. 17, it illustrates what our Lord had said thirty-one years or a generation earlier.

John xiv. 20. In that day, you will know—you—
That I [am] in My Father,

And you in Me,
And I in you.

We may also note that St. Paul uses the verb *kat-oikeîn*, "to dwell," for this implies permanent dwelling, and is contrasted with *par-oikeîn*, "to sojourn," as in the Greek Vulgate of *Genesis* xxxvii. 1, where it is said,

Jacob was dwelling in the land,
Where his father sojourned.

The verb in our present passage is in the aorist or indefinite past time, and describes an act, done once and definitely. But with this, we must take into account the fact that such an indwelling of the Christ may be repeated in ever fuller measure, just as the omnipresent Spirit may be said to come afresh in each new mode or degree of operation and manifestation.

We found that the phrase, "in your hearts," *Eph.* iii. 17c, corresponded to the Pauline expression, "the inward man," which is found three times in the Greek Testament, 2 *Cor.* iv. 16, *Rom.* vii. 22, and *Eph.* iii. 16e. The latter is paraphrased by St. Peter as "the hidden man of the heart," 1 *Pet.* iii. 4. But we must first of all deny any direct connection between the *ēsō*, "inward" man of St. Paul, and the *ēntōs*, "inside" man of Plato's *Republic* ix. 589. St. Paul's contrast between the *ēsō*, or "inward" man, and the *ēxō*, or "outward" man, is, however, apparently reproduced in that between the *eisō*, or "inward" man, and the *ēxō*, or "outward" man, as we find it in the *Enneads* V. i. 10, of Plotinus, the Alexandrian Neoplatonist and Origen's

fellow-pupil, who founded a school at Rome in 244 A.D., and published those *Enneads* between that date and his death in 270 A.D. On the other hand, Plato's "inside" man is one of three forms, consisting of a man, a lion and a many-headed monster, representing reason, impulse and sense. These three are pictured as clothed externally with the one human form, the outward man.

But St. Paul's "outward" man and "inward" man, which must not be confused, as by Cornelius à Lapide, vol. xviii., p. 125, with his "old" or unregenerate man and his "new," or "fresh," or regenerate man, imply a contrast between the body with the sensuous and organic energies of the soul, and the higher or spiritual faculties of the soul, that is, thought and rational will. This interpretation is confirmed by the parallel in the present passage, *Eph.* iii. 16, 17, between "the inward man" and "your hearts," the heart representing the seat of the personal life, of consciousness, conscience and self-consciousness, of knowledge, will and emotion, *Deut.* vii. 17, viii. 2, 5, 17, ix. 4, 5, xix. 6, xxx. 14, 1 *Sam.* vii. 3, *Job.* xxvii. 6, *Psalms* civ. 15.

Made mighty by the Holy Spirit, and indwelt by the Christ, the soul is now able to put forth its supreme activity. This, in its supreme degree, will not be exercised till the Vision of God, the "Vision of the Blest." Then, indeed, but even then in an ever-increasing measure, the soul will perceive Messiah's love. And in the vision, it will know fully what it is to become a partaker of Divine nature, 2 *Pet.* i. 4. Then it will be like the Messiah, for it will see Him as He is, 1 *John* iii. 2. And mirroring the glory of [the] Lord, it will be transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as [befits a change, which proceeds] from [the] Lord, [the] Spirit, 2 *Cor.* iii. 18.

St. Paul prayed that his readers might receive the Spirit's

might and the Messiah's indwelling. This was in order that they might know Messiah's love. And that knowledge was to fill them unto all the fulness of God. There is nothing beyond.

But before stating this purpose, the Apostle interjects a note, describing his readers as "rooted and founded." Therefore, the lines run,

Eph. iii. 17b. —[You] having been rooted
And having been founded—

18. In order that you may be fully strengthened to apprehend with all the holy [ones],
What is the breadth and length and depth and height—

19. And [even] to know the—exceeding knowledge—love of the Christ,
In order that you may be filled unto all the fulness of God.

The two perfect participles, "having been rooted" and "having been founded," are suggested by a reminiscence of *Col.* ii. 7, where, the Apostle having mentioned their reception of the Christ Jesus, bids his readers to walk in [union and communion with] the Christ,

Col. ii. 7. Having been rooted
And being built up in Him.

So the figure of a tree, employed in *Psalms* i. 3, xcii. 12, *Jer.* xvii. 8, *1 Cor.* iii. 6, is combined with that of a temple, found in *1 Cor.* vi. 19. Indeed, both agriculture and architecture have already supplied the metaphors for

1 Cor. iii. 9. God's tilled-land,
God's building—you are.

And they will again supply them to the Syrian Lucian, when he, between 150 and 175 A.D., in his book on dancing, c. xxxiv., will refer to the "roots and foundations" of that art.

As the indwelling of the Christ occasioned the double metaphor in *Col.* ii. 7, it does so again in the present passage of the encyclical, *Eph.* iii. 17. Parenthetic though the expression may be, yet it reminds us that the higher stages of experience are only possible to a soul, when its life is sustained and invigorated by that of the Christ, whom it enshrines. However inconsistent with itself, the double metaphor may seem, it expresses a truth, that might break through a single image, and escape. And having regard to the parenthetic nature of the phrase, "rooted and founded," we need not assume that it ought to have followed "in order that," so that we might read,

In order that you, having been rooted
And having been founded, may apprehend.

We note that the verb "strengthened," *Eph.* iii. 18a, has the prefix *ex*, and therefore implies "fully strengthened." The verb "to apprehend" is second aorist, or indefinite past in time, and suggests one definite act. That verb is used of mental perception in *Acts* iv. 13, x. 34, xxv. 25. And references to the *Acts* in connection with this encyclical have the more value, as St. Luke, who is now in St. Paul's room, *Col.* iv. 14, is even now preparing that volume, and has already made many diarian notes, including the "we-sections," *Acts* xvi. 10-17, xx. 5-15, xxi. 1-18, xxvii. 1, xxviii. 16.

The words, "breadth," "length," "height" and "depth" *Eph.* iii. 18b, are grouped under one article. So they form but one figure. It is hardly probable that they are taken from a temple-building or from a Sanctuary or Holy Place,

such as that, which will give three dimensions, length, breadth and height, for the New Jerusalem, *Apoc.* xxi. 16. Yet Eadie, Bengel and Stier, in their commentaries, refer the figure to the Church as a temple; and Chandler and Macknight even connect it with the Ephesian temple of Artemis. It has been suggested that St. Paul's metaphors of a building and a tree, *Eph.* iii. 17, imply a fourth dimension in the foundation of the one and the root of the other. It has also been supposed that the four dimensions were suggested by the latitude, longitude, zenith and nadir of the speaker, who faces east in oriental fashion. But those four dimensions had been mentioned in *Job*, and referred to God, of whose wisdom it is said,

Job. xi. 8, 9. Heights of heaven ! what wilt thou do ?
Deeper than Sheol ! what wilt thou know ?

Its measure [is] longer than [the] earth,
And broader than [the] sea.

The expression may very well be explained as an accumulation of terms to express exhaustive measurement.

But what is measured ? According to Cramer's *Caténæ* of 1842, Severian of Gabala, who was St. Chrysostom's deputy at Constantinople in 401, interprets it as the Cross, the upward portion suggesting the Godhead, the downward the Humanity, and the two arms the mission eastward and westward. St. Jerome, in his commentary of 388, had explained the height of good angels, the depth of fallen angels, the length of good men, and the breadth of bad men on the broad way. But St. Chrysostom, in his commentary before 398, *hom.* vii., treats the figure as merely an illustration by the visible dimensions of a solid body, suggesting a man.

The Calvinist Zanchius, in the sixteenth century, adopting a suggestion of Photius in the ninth, interprets the measured

thing as salvation, from eternity in length, to all in breadth, involving a descent to hell in depth, and an ascent to heaven in height. Estius explains the length by times, the breadth by places, the height by glory, and the depth by wisdom. Bengel holds it to be the fulness of God, and Alford, the Mystery, that is measured.

Cornelius à Lapide, vol. xviii. pp. 617-619, offers a five-fold interpretation. First, the measurements are those of Christ or of Christ's love, as is suggested by St. Chrysostom and his imitators, Theodoret, Œcumenius and Theophylact. They are explained as those of Deity by St. Ambrose, St. Bernard in his treatise *On Consideration* v., St. Gregory, the First and the Great, in his *Morals* XI. x. xi., St. Anselm, St. Thomas Aquinas, and Cajetan. Thirdly, those dimensions are referred to the Cross, as by St. Gregory of Nyssa in his first oration *on the Resurrection*, St. Basil, St. John Damascene, St. Jerome, St. Bede, St. Anselm, and St. Augustine in his seventh sermon *on the Words of the Apostle*. Fourthly, they are treated as the dimensions of the Church by St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Anselm and St. Gregory in his sixth homily on *Ezekiel*. Finally, they are held by St. Anselm to be those of the New Jerusalem in heaven.

But the passage itself provides the clearest and most probable explanation. The Apostle would have his readers apprehend the full measurement of—and more than that, even to know—Messiah's love. That the verb "to know" stands in such a relation to the verb "to apprehend," is suggested by two facts. First of all, both are in the aorist or indefinite past form of the infinitive. Secondly, they are connected by the conjunction *tě*, "and," which is used often enough as equivalent to "namely," or "that is to say," showing that the word, to which it is attached, is epexegetic or explanatory of the preceding one. And we

may see in the *Epistle to the Romans*, how the Apostle has already used terms of measurement in connection with the Divine love, saying

Rom. viii. 39. Neither height nor depth,
Nor any other creation,

Will be able to separate us
From the Love of God,

[From] the [love] in Christ Jesus,
Our Lord.

At the same time, we see in our present passage, how St. Paul makes his statement more striking by inserting the phrase, "exceeding knowledge," in the place of an adjective between the article and its noun :

Eph. iii. 19a. And [even] to know the—exceeding knowledge—
love of the Christ.

He desires his readers to know this love, which exceeds knowledge. He would have them know the unknowable. St. Paul indeed is not averse from paradox or hyperbolé or oxymóron. For example, he has already said in *Rom.* i. 20, that God's unseen [attributes] are clearly seen. And he will say,

1 Tim. v. 6. But she who wantons—
Living—is dead.

In the present passage, there is a paradox, an oxymóron in the addition of a contrary epithet. Yet there is no absurdity but an indication of the profound truth that our knowledge can never be commensurate with its Divine Object, not even after ages and ages of the Beatific Vision. But none the less, that knowledge fills the soul unto all the fulness of God.

We are here presented with the fulness of God, not with

the fulness of the Christ, that is, the Church, as in *Eph.* i. 23. That fulness of Deity dwells in the Christ bodily, as St. Paul has already told the Colossians, ii. 9. For them he prayed that they might be filled with the full knowledge of God's will, *Col.* i. 9. In the present passage, the knowledge of the Christ's love is

Eph. iii. 19b. In order that you may be filled unto all the fulness of God.

Now "filled unto" means "filled unto the measure of." Therefore, the knowledge of the Christ's love is intended to fill the soul to such an extent, that it may become a counterpart of God's fulness. It will be as full in its own capacity, as God is in His. Yet the line means more; for the soul's capacity is to be expanded, till it reaches its ideal in the Head, *Eph.* iv. 15. And it only reaches fullgrown manhood in attaining

Eph. iv. 13. Unto [the full] measure of [the] stature
Of the fulness of the Christ,

that is, in reaching the ideal of the Church, by attaining

Unto the oneness of the faith [in]
And of the full knowledge of the Son of God.

If we complete this by St. Peter's phrase, "partakers of Divine nature," *2 Pet.* i. 4, we may see the harmony of the thought. By knowledge of the Messiah's love, we may reach the measure and ideal of a member in His Church. That measure and ideal is the Head, Messiah Himself. In Him, all the fulness of Deity dwells bodily. Therefore, the ultimate measure and ideal is the perfection of God in all His attributes. Such an ideal goal and measure is fitly theirs, who are partakers of God's nature. But the measure is immeasurable, and the ideal is ever being attained, but never attained.

Eph. iii. 14, 16, 19. Disputed Readings, "of our Lord Jesus Christ," "might," "you unto."

In the second prayer, there are three variations in the text, which are worthy of note. In *Eph.* iii. 14, St. Paul speaks of bending his knees toward the Father. A copyist, borrowing his phrase from *Eph.* i. 3, where we read, "Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," adds the words "of our Lord Jesus Christ," to the word, "Father," in the present case, although the expression interrupts the verbal play on "Father" and "family."

In *Eph.* iii. 16, St. Paul uses the expression "in order that He may give you." "May," the subjunctive mood, is correct after the present tense, "bend"; and it may cause us a suspicion that a grammarian has been editing the text. But we are able to explain the rival form, "might," the optative mood, as borrowed from the first prayer, *Eph.* i. 17, where it follows the present tense. The difference amounts only to an \bar{e} , the second aorist or indefinite past tense of the subjunctive mood being $d\acute{o}$, with an i under the \acute{o} , and the same tense of the optative being spelt by adding an \bar{e} .

In the third case, we read the last line of *Eph.* iii. 19, as

In order that you may be filled unto all the fulness of God.

The "you" is represented by *-te* at the end of the verb, and the "unto" by the preposition, *eis*. If these are omitted, the words must be rendered,

In order that it may be filled—all the fulness of God,
that is,

In order that all the fulness of God may be filled.

It is then argued that "the fulness of God" is the same

as "the fulness of the Christ." And as "the fulness of the Christ" means the Church, *Eph.* i. 23, therefore the clause refers to the completion of the Church. The sense is the easier and the poorer; and the evidence is miserable.

In the omission of the words, "of our Lord Jesus Christ," and in the omission of the final *ē*, so that we read "may," we find the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, probably of Cæsarea and 331, with the Alexandrian A and the Ephraem C, of Egypt and the fifth century. With these, we have the Alexandrian text in the cursive 17, of Cent. ix. or x., and about 290 A.D., the anti-Origenist, Methodius of Tyre, p. 719, Jahn's edition, 36, as well as St. Cyril of Jerusalem, who delivered his *Catechetical Lectures* about 346, and omits the words on pp. 112, 115, and the letter on p. 266.

In the insertion of both words and letter, we find two significant groups. The one is formed by the Claromontanus D, of the sixth century, and its ninth century copy, the Sangerman E. The other consists of the Syrian text in the two Greek uncials, Moscovian K and Angelic L, both of the ninth century, with the group, St. Chrysostom, Theodoret and Damascene. To these, we add the Valentinians of the second century, as quoted by Hippolytus, p. 193, and the *Exposition of the Right Faith* 5, wrongly attributed to St. Justin Martyr.

The words, "of our Lord Jesus Christ," are found also in the seventh century corrector of the Sinaitic Aleph, and in the twin Westerns, the Augien F and the Boernerian G. It is the Old Latin reading, as we see by the Old Latin manuscripts, those of the Latin Vulgate, except Demodivianus, of Cent. xii. or xiii., and those of the Gothic Version, made indeed after 341, but affected by the Old Latin after 568. This is confirmed by its presence in Victorinus and Ambrosiaster, who were both in Rome about 360, and by St. Jerome's explicit statement that he had found it in the

Latin manuscripts, but rejected it, vii. 598, 599, in Valarsi's edition. It is also an Old Syriac reading, as it is found in St. Ephraem iii. 333, and the Armenian version, as well as in the Syriac Vulgate of 411 and the Harclean Syriac of 616. We are not surprised to find it in Photius, in his book against Manichæism, iii. 16, about 858, as he naturally follows St. Chrysostom. And St. Basil, about 370 A.D., if indeed he was the author of the book *on Baptism* p. 644, was influenced by Origen, who appears to have read the phrase as it is found in i. 283e, ii. 130f, 279a, 462a, and iv. 686c, though this testimony comes in part through the Latin translator Rufinus about 400, and the words are omitted in i. 267e and in Cramer's *Caténæ* of 1842, vi. p. 161. To these witnesses, we should add the cursives, 47, of Cent. xi., and 37, of Cent. xv.

The phrase is rightly omitted by the Bohairic version, made for northern Egypt about 200 or 250, by the Ethiopic, made about 600, and by the Arabic edition, printed in 1616 from a manuscript of 1342. To these, we add St. Clement, head of the Alexandrian School about 189, in his *Selections from the Prophetic Writings* p. 994, Epiphanius, p. 850, consecrated for Salamis in Cyprus about 367, his contemporary, the Alexandrian Didymus, in his work *on the Trinity* pp. 49, 193, the Alexandrian Cyril, in his commentaries on *St. John* 173, 838, composed between 417 and 428, and in his work *on the Right Faith* p. 70, composed in 430, the Alexandrian Euthalius, in 458, the African Vigilius, in his work *on the Trinity* p. 12, about 484, and the corrector of the eleventh century cursive 67.

As to "may" we may regard it as read by Origen. True, Cramer's *Caténæ* of 1842, vi. p. 161, has "might," adding the *ē* on the first occurrence. But it omits it on the second occurrence, and on the next page. Besides, St. Basil, or the author of the book *on Baptism*, reads "may,"

and is under Origen's influence. The manuscripts of St. Athanasius witness against the printed editions, p. 543, for "may." And St. Ephraem presents the same reading.

Euthalius, the Alexandrian deacon of 458, gives both forms in his manuscript of 1301 A.D. The Alexandrian Cyril gives both forms in his commentaries on *St. John* pp. 173, 838, written between 417 and 428, but he has "might" in his work *on the Right Faith*, written in 430. Œcumenius, about 600 A.D., and Theophylact, about 1077, may also be laid aside in this matter, as they merely follow St. Chrysostom.

We need only add that "may" is found in the twin uncials, the Augien F and the Boernerian G, both of the ninth century and the Western form, and in the cursives, 39, of Cent. xii., 116, of Cent. xiii., and 37, of Cent. xv. On the other hand, "might" is read by the Porphyrian P, of the ninth century.

As to the third reading, we find the *-te* and *eis*, "you" and "unto," omitted in the Vatican B of the fourth century, and in the cursives, 17, of Cent. ix. or x., 73, of Cent. xi., and 116, of Cent. xiii. That is the total evidence for the omission; and it is very valuable as suggesting a relationship between those cursives and the Vatican B. Other value, it has none. It is not the first time the "Vatican" scribe has dropped a final *-te*. He has already done so in *Eph.* i. 13, where he read "he was sealed" for "you were sealed."

The evidence in favour of *-te* and *eis* includes the Sinaitic Aleph of the fourth century, the Alexandrian A and the Ephraem C of the fifth, the Claromontanus D, of the sixth, the Boernerian G, Moscovian K, Angelic L and Porphyrian P, of the ninth. This testimony of the uncial manuscripts is supported by that of many cursives, and by what is of great importance in this matter, the unanimous testimony

of the versions, Latin, Syriac, Gothic, Armenian, Bohairic and Ethiopic.

Eph. iii. 20, 21. The Second Doxology.

As the first prayer was followed by a doxology, *Eph.* i. 21-23, so is the second prayer by a second doxology, *Eph.* iii. 20, 21. The heart, raised in prayer to God, instinctively offers its tribute to His glory. In Jewish literature, there have been counted about a hundred forms for declaring God blessed, the benediction regularly commencing, "Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe." When the "Lord's Prayer" is said aloud as the "Prayer of the Faithful" in the Christian Liturgy, it is completed by an embolism or interpolation. In the present Byzantine service, this runs, "for thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, now and ever and unto the ages of the ages. Amen." Under different forms, this doxology may be traced back to an early time. In the *Teaching of the Twelve*, written in Syria in the last decade of the first century, it reads, "For Thine is the power and the glory for ever," x. 5. This was afterwards enlarged and inserted after the Lord's Prayer in *Matthew*, vi. 13.

The oldest manuscript of that text, in which it is found, is the Codex Rossanensis, denoted by the Greek Sigma or Σ, that is S, of the sixth century. The oldest version to represent the words is the Curetonian Syriac, that is, about 450. And the first commentator to note them was St. Chrysostom, in his nineteenth homily on *St. Matthew* before he left Antioch in 398. We can see by the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, of the fourth century, by the Bezan D and the Dublin Z, of the sixth century, by the Old Latin and the Latin Vulgate, by the Bohairic version and

Origen, by Tertullian and St. Cyprian, and by St. Cyril of Jerusalem, that the doxology does not belong to the original text, but forced an entrance in obedience to a very human instinct. And we may notice that the doxology, not found in the English versions from the thirteenth century to 1538, as these appear in Maskell's *Appendix to the Prymer*, succeeded at last in gaining admission to the Anglican Prayer Book of 1630, and to the Scotch edition of 1637.

The Pauline doxologies, then, are not based on that added to the Lord's Prayer, but may very well have sprung from a Jewish training so devout and from a liturgical custom so strong ; for grace, in this as in so much else, builds on nature.

As the first prayer sought for knowledge of God's power unto us, the doxology of the second speaks of God's power in us. But the object of the ascription is to declare the glory of the Father, with whom nothing is impossible, *Gen.* xviii. 14, *Luke* i. 37. St. Paul then proposes to say "Glory "

Eph. iii. 20. To Him, who is able to do above all things,
Which we ask for ourselves, or understand.

But he takes up a word, "superabundantly," which he used in the same form, *1 Thess.* iii. 10, and in almost the same form, *1 Thess.* v. 13, about May, 52, just about nine years ago. He interjects it as a comparative, so that the "which " becomes genitive and equivalent to "than those things which." And the sentence runs,

Eph. iii. 20. But to Him, who is able to do above all things—
[More] superabundantly than [those things]
which we ask for ourselves, or understand—

According to the Power,
Which is active in us—

21. To Him [be] the glory in the Church
And in Christ Jesus

Unto all the generations
Of the age of the ages. Amen.

The word, "superabundantly" reminds us of St. Paul's tendency to use forms, compounded with *hyper*-, corresponding to the Latin *super*-. In the Greek Testament, there are twenty-eight such compounds. Of these, twenty-two are found in the Pauline epistles and that *to the Hebrews*. And of these again, twenty are found only there.

As to the power, active in us, St. Paul pointed out to the Roman Christians, that the Holy Spirit within us prays for us better than we can, *Rom.* viii. 26. Now he points out that the Father, in accord with that Holy Spirit within us, can do more for us, than we can express in our petitions, or understand by our intelligence. In writing to the Colossians, however, it is Messiah's activity within him, on which the Apostle lays stress, telling how he toils, combating

Col. i. 29. According to His activity,
Which is active in me in power.

Some difficulty has been raised with regard to the present participle, which we have rendered "is active." It may, of course, be passive, or it may be reflexive. Some say that it is passive, alleging 2 *Cor.* i. 6, where such a meaning is more than questionable, for the better translation is,

2 *Cor.* i. 6. Or whether we are comforted,
[It is] on behalf of your comfort,
Which is active in endurance
Of the same sufferings ;

and then to explain the word "same," St Paul adds,

Which we also suffer.

It is not the endurance which produces the comfort. But it is the comfort and consolation of St. Paul, which is communicated to his readers for their comfort and consolation. And this comfort and consolation of theirs enables them to endure sufferings like those of St. Paul.

Those who hold the verb to be passive in *Eph.* iii. 20, suggest that it should be rendered "is made to work," or "is wrought out." But the Gothic, Syriac, Armenian and Ethiopic versions represent it as middle or reflexive; and all the passages in which the form occurs, *Jas.* v. 16, *Gal.* v. 6, 1 *Thess.* ii. 13, 2 *Thess.* ii. 7, 2 *Cor.* i. 6, iv. 12, *Rom.* vii. 5, *Col.* i. 29, and *Eph.* iii. 20, prefer a middle or reflexive sense to a passive one. Why then does St. Paul use the middle form rather than the active, since both imply "to be active"? Lightfoot, on *Galatians* v. 6, thinks that the active form is used, when the subject is the Spirit of God, or the Spirit of Evil. On the other hand, he thinks that the middle voice implies a human agent or mind. Winer prefers to say that the active form is used, when the subject is a person; and the middle form, in other cases. But frankly, we do not know.

Glory to God is given in the Church, *Eph.* iii. 21. That Church has been presented as the Body, completing Christ, the Head, *Eph.* i. 23. And now, as the object lesson of God's Wisdom to heavenly intelligences, it is the scene and sphere of His manifested glory. Not there alone, however, is God's glory made known, for His dominion will be vindicated over the whole creation. His glory will be manifested in everything, especially in the Church,

Eph. iii. 21. And in Christ Jesus

The mention of our Lord after the Church occasioned no difficulty to St. Jerome, who writes in his commentary, and most probably under Origen's influence, "And so let there be glory to God Himself; first of all, in the Church, which is pure, not having stain or wrinkle, and which can receive the glory of God on this account, that it is the Body of Christ. Then [let there be glory to God] in Christ Jesus, because all the Divinity dwells bodily in the Body of the assumed manhood, all the members of which consist of believers." The name of our Blessed Lord naturally follows the mention of the Church, as the sentence is rising to a climax. So the sentence stands in the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, of the fourth century, and in the Alexandrian A and the Ephraem C, of the fifth. These are supported by the Bohairic version, made about 200 or 250 A.D. So apparently, Origen read the words, if we may judge from St. Jerome's Latin commentary of 388. And the same reading is found in the Latin Vulgate of 385, and in such cursives as 17, of Cent. ix. or x., 73 and 80, of Cent. xi., and 213, of Cent. xiv.

But to avoid the appearance of placing our Lord beneath the Church, the order of the names is reversed by the Claromontanus D, of the sixth century and probably of Egypt. In this, it is led or supported by the Latin version d which accompanies it, and followed by the Latin version of the Sangerman e, made from d in the ninth century. It would be interesting to know how the same arrangement was adopted by the twin uncials, the Augien F and the Boernerian G, both in their Greek and in their Latin columns, as these were made in the ninth century, and probably in Italy. But it may be found that the alteration was originally made in the Old Latin version and in Rome, for we find it in Victorinus and Ambrosiaster, both of whom lived in Rome about 360.

Others did not venture on so drastic a procedure. They merely dropped the "and," so the lines read,

Eph. iii. 21. To Him [be] the glory in the Church
In Christ Jesus.

Now, it is by no means easy to arrange fossils in a genealogical order, as even the genealogists of the horse must confess in their less exalted moments. But the science of Textual Criticism has reached its genealogical phase, so we may suggest that the "and" was probably dropped first of all in the Old Syriac version. It is omitted in the Gothic version, made in Dacia by Ulphilas or Wulfila, that is, Little Wolf, after his consecration at Constantinople in 341. We may point out that his parents had been carried away about 300 A.D., by invading Goths to Dacia from Cappadocia. In the second place, the conjunction "and" is omitted by the Armenian version, made after 431, and containing some Old Syriac readings. In the third place, it is not found in the Syriac Vulgate of 411, or in the Harclean Syriac of 616. And an Old Syriac source would account for the unanimity of Dacia, Armenia and Osroëne.

It was easy for the reading to pass into Syrian Antioch, where we find it in St. Chrysostom's seventh homily on this encyclical. Those sermons were preached, as we have already found reason to believe, before he left Antioch for Constantinople in 398. Of course, we find the word omitted by his imitators, the Syrian Theodoret, consecrated in 423, Œcumenius, who lived about 600, St. John Damascene, who flourished between 717 and 741, and Theophylact, who was alive in 1077. Their witness is one, and Chrysostom's.

The "and" is omitted by the Alexandrian Euthalius in 458, and by the African Vigilius, in his work *on the Trinity*

xii., in Migne lxii., written about 484. Then it is struck out by the first corrector of the Claromontanus D, and omitted by the Ethiopic translator at the same time, about 600 A.D.

It was naturally excluded by the Syrian texts in the uncials, Moscovian K and Angelic L, in the ninth century, the Porphyrian P also presenting a Syrian Text at that time and in this place. To this Syrian evidence, we may add the cursives, 47, of Cent. xi., and 37 of Cent. xv.

We note the parallel formed by "all the generations" and "the age of the ages," *Eph.* iii. 21, c, d. The former phrase implies the successive stages of that immeasurable time, described as "the age of the ages." The latter expression was probably suggested by the words, "until age of the ages," found in Theodotion's version of *Dan.* vii. 18, or rather in that older version, which Theodotion will use about 180 A.D. The phrase is also found in *Third Esdras* iv. 38, written between 170 and 100 B.C., at Alexandria.

The doxology closes, as doxologies were wont to do, *Tobit*, viii. 8, 3 *Macc.* vii. 23, 4 *Macc.* xviii. 24, with the Hebrew word 'amēn, meaning "firmly," and hence "surely." In *Num.* v. 22, it evidently means "so be it," as also in the Ebal curses of *Deut.* xxvii. 15-26, in *Jer.* xi. 5, xxviii. 6, and in closing each of the first four books of the *Psalms*, xli. 13, lxxii. 19, lxxxix. 52, cvi. 48. The synagogue custom of answering "Amen" to thanksgivings passed over to the Christian congregations, especially in regard to the greatest of eucharistic utterances, 1 *Cor.* xiv. 16. And now, it fitly closes the second doxology and the first part of the encyclical.

CHAPTER IV

LIFE IN THE CHURCH

In the first chapter, God's Eternal Counsel was unveiled. In the second, we saw the realisation of it. In the third, St. Paul unfolded his own ministry in its regard. Now we reach the manifestation of it in Christian lives. So the Apostle proceeds to reduce the doctrine to practice. Therefore, the second three chapters apply the principles of the first three to the Church, *Eph.* iv. 1-16; holiness, iv. 17-24; social life, iv. 25-32; pleasures, v. 1-21; husband and wife, v. 22-33; parent and child, vi. 1-4; master and slave, vi. 5-9; and spiritual difficulties, vi. 10-18.

The fourth chapter, then, deals with a Christian's life in Church, heart, and society. But in the case of life in the Church, there are four subjects for consideration. First, there is its unity, iv. 1-6; then, its diversity of gifts, iv. 7-11; thirdly, its ideal, iv. 12-14; and finally, its corporate life, iv. 15, 16.

Eph. iv. 1-6. The Unity of the Church

In the *Epistle to the Romans*, written in January, 57, a little more than four years earlier, the Apostle, after a doxology, had resumed with the words, "I therefore exhort you," *Rom.* xii. 1. Those very words will serve him now in a similar case. He can add the little phrase, "I, the

prisoner in [the] Lord," parenthetically. This will persuade by its pathos, as in the letter which he has just dictated to *Philemon*, 9. So in 115 A.D., little more than half a century later, St. Ignatius will write to the Trallian Christians from Smyrnâ, saying, xii., "My bonds, which I carry about for sake of Jesus Christ, exhort you." But there is also the dignity of the martyr, the prestige of sacrifice and suffering. This is enhanced beyond measure by his union with our Lord, for he is "the prisoner in [the] Lord." This title "Lord" is now chosen to imply authority and dominion, for the theme is conduct. On another occasion, St. Paul had indeed spoken of himself as "the prisoner of the Christ Jesus," *Eph.* iii. 1; but then the subject was his own ministry in uniting both Jews and Gentiles with the same Messiah or Christ, Jesus. These considerations, especially the phrases in *Rom.* xii. 1, and *Eph.* iii. 1, lead us to regard the whole phrase, "I, the prisoner in [the] Lord," as parenthetic. So we cannot follow those, who would explain the words "the prisoner" as alone parenthetic, and would render the sentence as "I exhort you in [the] Lord."

So the first lines run,

Eph. iv. 1. I, therefore, exhort you—
I, the prisoner in [the] Lord—

To walk worthily
Of the calling, with which you were called.

In May, 52, about nine years before, St. Paul had exhorted the Thessalonians,

1 Thess. ii. 12. Unto the end that you may walk worthily of God,
Who is calling you unto His own Kingdom and
glory.

He has just urged the Colossians to walk worthily of the Lord, *Col. i. 10*. And within a few months, he will call upon the Philippians to act worthily of the Gospel, *Phil. i. 27*. But as he has just spent the first three chapters of this encyclical in unfolding all the hope, involved in the fact of God's call to them, he now appeals on the basis of that call. He has illustrated the Christian's position by that of a limb in the Messiah's Body, by that of a stone in God's Temple, and by that of a member in God's family. He would have them walk worthily of such a calling. But, as he emphasised the noun, "grace," *Eph. i. 6*, the noun, "activity," *Eph. i. 19*, and the word, "love," *Eph. ii. 4*, so he now emphasises the word "calling" by adding the cognate verb, and speaking of "the calling, with which you were called." The relative would indeed have been in the cognate accusative form, but it has been attracted into the genitive by the preceding words, "of the calling."

There are three dispositions, which the Apostle would desire his readers to possess. He will name them in urging his readers to walk

**Eph. iv. 2. With all lowlimindedness and mildness :
With longanimity—**

The first two are more closely connected in meaning. They are also conjoined under one preposition, *metá*, "with," which is so used of attendant dispositions in the phrases "with all readiness," *Acts xvii. 11*, and "with fear and trembling," *2 Cor. vii. 15*. Such use of the preposition makes the dispositions mentioned stand out more distinctly than the simple dative would have done. And the stress on them is the more evident, when we note how the Apostle has just spoken to the Colossians, saying,

Col. iii. 12. Put on, therefore—
 As God's elect,
 Holy and loved—
 A heart of compassion,

 Kindness, lowlimindedness,
 Mildness, longanimity.

The encyclical form, as we see, is more emphatic :

Eph. iv. 2. With all lowlimindedness and mildness :
 With longanimity—

There is a difference of opinion between St. Chrysostom and Dr. Trench as to the meaning of lowlimindedness, the former explaining the word by a great man's self-humiliation, and the latter by a self-estimation, that is low, because true. Now, the implication of the word must be determined by the Greek Testament, where it is found for the first time, though the adjective occurs in the Greek Vulgate of *Proverbs* xxix. 23, and the verb in that of *Psalms* cxxxi. 2. It would appear that it can be used of such affected humility, as that of the Colossian heretics, *Col.* ii. 18, and of the most genuine, such as St. Paul's, during his stay at Ephesus, *Acts* xx. 19. In the present passage, lowlimindedness, as a disposition for the social life, of which the Apostle is about to speak, implies a relation to other men, so it cannot be a question of self-estimation alone. It must also involve a willingness to receive less, to be placed lower, and to be treated worse, than one is entitled to expect.

As to "mildness," the pagans will help us but little. When Plato, in his "Banquet" 197d, contrasts it with *agriôtēs*, "roughness," and Aristotle, in his *History of Animals* ix. 1, with *chālēpōtēs*, "harshness," it is clear that they regard it as good manners. But in his *Nicomachean Ethics* IV. v., Aristotle shows a more serious study of the

matter. He there defines mildness as the mean between irascibility and all lack of resentment. According to him, the mild man is one, who is angry in accordance with the occasion, person, manner, time and length of time.

But in the Greek Vulgate of *Ps.* xlv. 4, the word, *prāūtēs*, "mildness," is used to represent the Hebrew, 'anwāh, "humility," or rather Messiah's "gentleness." So the adjective, *prāūs*, "mild," in *Ps.* cxlvii. 6, cxlix. 4, renders the Hebrew 'ānāw, a word that means humble, pious, and unresentful. In the Greek Vulgate of *Zephaniah*, iii. 12, we find the word, *prāūs*, "mild," employed to render the Hebrew, 'ānī, "poor and pious," the Greek word, *tāpeinos*, "humble," representing the Hebrew *dāl*, "feeble and ignoble."

In the Greek Testament, the word is used of our Blessed Lord, *2 Cor.* x. 1. It is contrasted with an avenging, *1 Cor.* iv. 21, a resentful, *2 Tim.* ii. 25, and a contentious spirit, *Titus*, iii. 2. So we may say that in the New Testament, the word tends to represent that unresentfulness, which Aristotle thought an extreme and a departure from the mean. But between Aristotle's *Ethics* and St. Paul's epistles, there had appeared a new Ideal, realised not in the form of Hercules or Apollo, but in that of Divine Love, lowly, serving and crucified.

The third disposition required is that of longanimity. The noun, *makrothumía*, is used in *Jer.* xv. 15. The corresponding adjective is found in *Exod.* xxxiv. 6, *Num.* xiv. 18, *Ps.* lxxxvi. 15, *Prov.* xv. 18, xvi. 32, and *Eccles.* vii. 8, for the Hebrew, 'érekh 'aph, "slow of anger," literally "long of anger." In *1 Macc.* viii. 4, it is used of endurance, the Roman conquest of Spain being explained by counsel and longanimity. Dr. Trench would distinguish it as patience in respect of persons, from *hupōmōnē*, as endurance in respect of things. The word is used in *Rom.*

ii. 4, and ix. 22, of God's relation to the wicked. It precedes "kindness" in *Gal.* v. 22, and *2 Cor.* vi. 6. But the best interpretation of the word is that given by St. Paul in the next line, the motive of action being added in a parallel.

Eph. iv. 2c. Bearing with one another in love,

3. Being zealous to keep the oneness of the Spirit in the co-bond of peace.

We may note the parallelism in the phrasing. First of all, "bearing with one another," is answered by "being zealous to keep the oneness of the spirit." Then "in love" is met by "in the co-bond of peace." The participles, "bearing with" and "being zealous," are in the nominative case, though we should expect the accusative after "I exhort," and in agreement with "you." But the sentence is practically broken after "longanimity"; and these two lines are interjected parenthetically to describe the conduct, which the required dispositions produce. By similar parentheses, we explain similar nominatives in the *Apocalypse* ii. 13, 20, iii. 12, xvi. 13, xx. 2, and in the Greek Vulgate of *Ezekiel* xxiii. 6, 7.

Of the participles in our present passage, *Eph.* iv. 2c, 3, the former is better translated "bearing with" than "forbearing with." The latter rendering would suggest the prefix *ap-* rather than *an-*. This is clear from the maxim of Epictetus, *an-échou kai ap-échou*, "bear and forbear," *Aulus Gellius* xvii. 19. So, St. Paul urges his readers to bear with one another, and this in love, not in conscious superiority, or in self-conscious martyrdom.

They should also be zealous to keep that oneness, which had been given to them. This will be a means of attaining that oneness of faith and of "the full knowledge of the Son of God," which St. Paul will presently set before them, *Eph.* iv. 13. Now they have the oneness of the Spirit.

In his comment on the verse, St. Chrysostom points out the analogy between the human spirit in the different members of the human body and the Divine Spirit in the Church's members, who differ in race and customs. So St. Paul himself taught nearly six years ago, when he wrote his first *Epistle to the Corinthians* from Ephesus in the autumn of 55, saying,

1 Cor. xii. 13. For truly, we all—in one Spirit—
We were baptised into one Body,

Whether Jews or Greeks,
Whether bondmen or freemen.

Unfortunately, Ambrosiaster, who wrote at Rome under Pope Dámasus, 366-384, and was probably Faustinus, interpreted the "Spirit" in *Eph.* iv. 3, as the human spirit. In this, he was followed by St. Anselm, who became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1093, and by Calvin, who began his second period at Geneva in 1541. But we have found the explanation of the Spirit as the Divine Spirit, simple, consistent and sufficient. And we see that the oneness of the Spirit here is supplemented by the oneness of the faith in *Eph.* iv. 13, as the phrase, "by means of the Spirit," is paralleled by the phrase, "by means of the faith," in *Eph.* iii. 16, 17.

We have rendered *sún-desmos* as "co-bond," because we have in other cases represented the prefix *sun-* or *syn-* by "co-." The word suggests more than "bond," as it implies, not the binding of one person, but the binding together of two or more. Still, we must ask the meaning of the phrase, "the co-bond of peace." It is argued that the genitive represents apposition, and that the expression therefore means, "the co-bond, that is, peace," or "the co-bond, consisting in peace." So in *Acts* viii. 23, St. Peter declares Simon Magus to be still in "the co-bond of

injustice," that is, "the co-bond, consisting of injustice." Now, at this point, it is hardly relevant to introduce such considerations as the fact that the Messiah "is our peace," *Eph.* ii. 14, uniting Jews and Gentiles.

The solution lies within a very small space. It is found in the parallel line and in the parallel passage. For the phrase, "in the co-bond of peace" corresponds to "in love" in the preceding line. And the parallel passage, *Col.* iii. 13-15, of which our two lines, *Eph.* iv. 2c, d, are a condensed presentment, shews that the phrase, "the co-bond of peace," means simply the peaceful union of souls, united by Christian love. It is then the peace bequeathed and given by the Messiah at His Last Supper, *John* xiv. 27.

Finally, we may read those two lines in connection with the parallels in the *Epistle to the Colossians*. The former present our ideal of conduct as

Eph. iv. 2c. Bearing with one another in love,
Being zealous to keep the oneness of the Spirit in
the co-bond of peace.

In its more original and fuller form, the exhortation ran,

Col. iii. 13. Bearing with one another,
And forgiving yourselves [that is, your brothers],
If anyone against anyone
May have a complaint.

According as the Lord also forgave you,
So also [do] you.

14. But to all these, [add] love,
Which [thing] is co-bond of perfectness.

15. And let the peace of Christ umpire
In your hearts ;
Unto which [peace] you were also called
In one Body ;
And become thankful.

Those words, "one body," suggested the next line of the encyclical to St. Paul, and introduce them to us. As in the creed-like verse, 1 *Tim.* ii. 5, there is no verb in the Greek; and we lose the watchword style of the lines by inserting one. The themes, too, are in three triplets. The first is that of the Holy Spirit, with the body, which He animates, and with the hope, which He inspires. The second is that of our Lord, with the faith, which submits the soul to Him in life, *Rom.* i. 5, xvi. 26, and with the baptism, which identifies the soul with Him in His death, *Rom.* vi. 5. The third is that of God the Father, ruling, working and dwelling in all. So the passage in its arrangement reminds us of that composed nearly six years earlier,

- 1 Cor. xii. 4. But there are divisions of gifts,
But the same Spirit.
5. And there are divisions of ministries,
And the same Lord.
6. And there are divisions of activities,
But the same God, who is active as to all things
in all.

In the encyclical, St. Paul has already spoken of the one body, *Eph.* ii. 16, and the one Spirit, *Eph.* ii. 18. He has even used the very phrase, "hope of the calling," *Eph.* i. 18. But now, indicating the sevenfold unity of the Church, he says,

- Eph.* iv. 4. One Body and one Spirit—
According as you were called
In one hope of your calling—
5. One Lord, one faith, one baptism.
6. One God and Father of all,
Who is over all and through all and in all.

St. Paul does not say that his readers were called "into hope," as if the hope followed the call in the order of time. But he says, "in hope," as if the very call constituted them in hope. The faith stands for the common obedience of faith to our Lord, who is so named here, as His dominion is in question. The phrases "over all" and "through all" and "in all" are clearly parallel and relative to the "God and Father of all," whom they describe as ruling, acting and dwelling in all. Some, like Darby, have seen gradually increasing circles in the whole passage, as if the sphere of the Lord was larger than that of the Spirit, but less than that of the Father. Others have referred the rule, action and indwelling of the Father to all creation. But St. Paul adduces the facts as an argument for the unity of the faithful. And his reference is certainly to the supernatural life of the Church, to the world of grace, and not to that of nature.

Eph. iv. 6b. A Disputed Reading, "us."

Our interpretation of the last line,

Eph. iv. 6b. Who is over all and through all and in all,

as referring to the Church, and not to men in general, or to the Universe, is confirmed by the glosses, inserted to make that view explicit.

St. Chrysostom, before he left Antioch in 398, and in his eleventh homily on this encyclical, inserted the pronoun, "you" to explain the reference of the word "all." It was from him that it passed to the Antiochian Theodoret, consecrated for Cyrus on the Euphrates in Upper Syria about 423, to the Thessalian bishop, Œcumenius, about 600, and to Theophylact, who was Archbishop of the Bulgarians in 1077.

More widespread results attended the effort to add "us." This is definitely a "Western" Reading, that is, a second-century gloss. We find it in Firmilian, bishop of Cappadocian Caesarea, in the letter, which he wrote in 256 to St. Cyprian of Carthage, that Greek letter being preserved in what seems to be St. Cyprian's own Latin translation, p. 150. The pronoun is in St. Hilary's treatise *on the Trinity* xi. 1., written in 358, and in both Victorinus and Ambrosiaster, who lived in Rome about 360. It is also in the Latin translation of St. Irenaeus, pp. 118, 253, 270, 315. That Father wrote in Greek between 182 and 188; and his Greek work was used by Tertullian at the end of the century. But the Latin version was not made, so Westcott and Hort argue in their *New Testament in Greek* ii. 160, till the fourth century; and it was used by St. Augustine about 421. St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate also has the word. That version of the Pauline epistles is only a modified form of the Old Latin, and was made in 385. To find the Old Latin, we must take the Latin columns in the Claromontanus d, of the sixth century, its copy, the Sangerman e, of the ninth, and the twin uncials, the Augien f and the Boernerian g, of the ninth. There we find the pronoun, which probably passed from the Latin columns to the Greek, as these Greek manuscripts show some signs of having been Latinised by their Old Latin versions. It was probably from the Old Latin also that the Gothic version derived the pronoun, which is also found in the *Speculum* or "Mirror," m, p. 5, of Cent. viii. or ix.

As a "Western" variant, we should expect to find the pronoun "us" in the Old Syriac. In the absence of manuscripts, we look to the Armenian version, made after 431, the Syriac Vulgate of 411, and the Harclean Syriac of 616, as these certainly contain some Old Syriac readings. We find the pronoun in each.

It is of little importance, except to complete the available evidence, to note that the pronoun "us" is also found in the *Dialogue*, p. 869, written about 300, and wrongly attributed to Origen, in St. John Damascene, between 717-741, and in the work *against the Manichaeans*, iii. 16, by Photius, who became patriarch of Constantinople in 858. It appears also in the Syrian text of the ninth century uncials, the Moscovian K and the Angelic L, and of the cursives, 47, of Cent. xi., and 37, of Cent. xv.

The evidence for the omission of a pronoun is overwhelming. This includes the Antisemite Marcion, who visited Rome in 142, and transmitted two quotations of our passage through Epiphanius, pp. 319b, 374b, who became bishop of Salamis in Cyprus about 368. Then there is the Bohairic version, made for northern Egypt about 200 or 250. Origen became head of the Alexandrian School in 203, and founder of the Cæsarean in 231. Cramer's *Caténæ* vi. p. 170, of 1842, represents him as omitting the pronoun. And St. Jerome's commentary, vii. 609, 610, 611, written under his influence, makes us confident that he did so. Then in 331, as is most probable, the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B appeared without the pronoun. At that very time was flourishing Marcellus, bishop of Galatian Ancyra. In quoting him, and in writing himself against him, Eusebius of Caesarea, in 336, omits the pronoun as he does also in his commentary on the *Psalms*. About the same time St. Athanasius quotes the line without the word. About 360, Victorinus of Rome, in his work *Against the Arians* i. 21. vol. viii. p. 159, in the edition of Gallandius, and in 386, St. Ambrose of Milan, in his commentary on *St. Luke* pp. ii, 20, follow suit. The "Long Recension" of the *Ignatian Epistles* is probably due to this period, the latter half of the fourth century; and it also omits the pronoun, pp. 264, 324.

In the first half of the fifth century, the same evidence is continued by the Alexandrian A and the Ephraem C, both most probably of Alexandria, and by the Alexandrian Cyril, in his commentaries on *St. John*, p. 1000, written between 417 and 428, and in his work *on the Right Faith*, p. 107, in 430. In the second half of the century, there is the Alexandrian Euthalius, who wrote in 458, and is represented by a manuscript of 1301.

The Moscovian Ob marks the sixth century, and the Ethiopic version, its close. In the ninth century, we have the Porphyrian P. The cursive 17 belongs to Cent. ix. or x.; and 71, to Cent. x. or xi. Cursives 31, 73 and 80 belong to Cent. xi. With these, we class the corrector of the eleventh century cursive 67. The cursive 109 is of Cent. xiii. or xiv. The Arabic manuscript, from which Erpenius derived his printed edition of 1616, is of Cent. xiv. Finally, the Greek cursive, 177, is of Cent. xv. And these continue the evidence for the omission.

Eph. iv. 7-II. The Diversity of Gifts.

Having dealt with the unity, the Apostle proceeds to speak of the diversity in the unity. But that very diversity is a motive to conduct in accordance with the unity, for it is an ordered, designed diversity, in which each is a complement of the others and a constituent of the whole. A little more than four years earlier, St. Paul had written in a similar strain to the Romans. As now, he had uttered his doxology, *Rom.* xi. 33-36, *Eph.* iii. 20, 21. He had resumed with the same phrase, "I, therefore, exhort you," *Rom.* xii. 1, *Eph.* iv. 1. He had appealed for worthy dispositions and conduct, *Rom.* xii. 1, 2, *Eph.* iv. 1-6. He had spoken of the grace, given to him, *Rom.* xii. 3, as now of the grace, given to him and them, *Eph.* iv. 7. Then he

spoke about the measure of faith, and named the various gifts, *Rom.* xii. 3-8, as now he will speak about the measure of the Messiah's gift, and about His various gifts to the Church, *Eph.* iv. 7-11.

In writing to the Corinthians from Ephesus in the autumn of 55, he had said,

- 1 Cor. xii. 8. For a word of wisdom is being given to one by means of the Spirit ;
 But a word of knowledge to another [man] according to the same Spirit ;
9. Faith to a different [man] in the same Spirit ;
 But gifts of healings to another in the one Spirit ;
10. But the activities of powers to another ;
 But prophecy to another ;
 But discernings of spirits to another ;
 Kinds of tongues to a different [man] ;
 But interpretation of tongues to another.

We note the list and the mode of naming the gifts. There are included a wise word, a learned word, faith, cures, miracles, prophecy, discernings of spirits, tongues, and power of interpreting tongues.

The list, which St. Paul gives to the Roman Christians, when he writes in the January of 57 from Corinth, does not include such gifts as miracles and tongues. It begins with the abstract, and passes to the concrete form, or rather from the gifts to the gifted. He urges the possessors of the gifts to occupy themselves with them,

- Rom. xii. 6. Whether prophecy, according to the measure of the faith ;
7. Whether ministry, in the ministry ;
 Whether he who teaches, in the teaching ;
8. Whether he who exhorts, in the exhortation ;

He, who is distributing [his own goods], in simplicity ;

He, who is presiding, in zeal ;

He, who is pitying, in cheerfulness,

Now in 61, the encyclical will present a list of the gifted, including apostles, prophets, evangelists, shepherds and teachers, the shepherds and teachers being closely connected under one article. And two years later, in the spring of 63, St. Peter, who so often shews himself acquainted with the Pauline Epistles in general and with this encyclical in particular, will depict the ideal realised by those who are

1 Pet. iv. 9. Hospitable unto one another without murmuring ;

10. Each, according as he received a gift [charisma],

Ministering it unto themselves [that is, their brethren],

As honourable stewards of God's varied grace.

11. If anyone speaks—as oracles of God ;

If anyone ministers—as out of strength, which God supplies.

Now, in the present passage, St. Paul dictates ;

Eph. iv. 7. But to each one of us was given the grace,
According to the measure of the gift [dōrēá]
of the Christ.

Then he accommodates three lines from *Psalm* lxviii. 18,
to Ascension Day and Pentecost,

Eph. iv. 8. Wherefore he says,
“ When He ascended unto [the] height,

“ He captured captivity :

“ He gave gifts [domata] to men.”

Now the Apostle must explain two of those words, "ascended" and "gave." In the quotation, "ascended" is indeed in the form of the second aorist or indefinite past participle ; but that does not hinder St. Paul from putting it into the indicative mood, saying,

Eph. iv. 9. But the [word] "He ascended,"
What is it ?

If not that He also descended
Into the lower parts of the earth.

But the word directly means an ascension ; and in our Lord's case, it was an ascension not only to be the goal, the centre, and the summary of all things with which He should be filled, *Eph.* i. 23, but also to be the source of power and grace to all the universe, and especially to the Church. In His triumph He receives tribute, it is true ; but He also distributes largesses. Therefore, St. Paul adds,

Eph. iv. 10. He who descended—He—
Is also He who ascended

Over-above all the heavens,
In order that He may fill all the things.

And having explained the word "ascended," St. Paul proceeds to illustrate the word "gave," saying

Eph. iv. 11. And He,—He gave some [men] indeed as
apostles,

But some as prophets,

But some as evangelists,

But some as shepherds and teachers.

In *Eph.* iv. 8, the word "says" may mean "He says," referring to the Messiah, or it may more probably and more indefinitely mean "he says," or "one says." In *Eph.* v. 14, St. Paul will use the very same expression with reference to words, not found in the Old Testament Canon. In *Gal.* iii. 16, and in *1 Cor.* vi. 16, the word "he says" refers to the Scripture, that subject being explicitly added in *Gal.* iv. 30, and in *Rom.* x. 11. In the present passage, it is evident that St. Paul is referring to *Psalms* lxviii. 19, not by way of direct quotation and argument, but by way of adaptation and illustration. In the Hebrew text of the *Psalms*, the words plainly mean,

Ps. lxviii. 19. Thou didst ascend to the height ;
Thou didst capture captivity :

Thou didst take gifts in the man.

That psalm, suggested by the "Song of Deborah," *Judges* v. 4, 5, describes God's march at the head of His people into Canaan and into Zion. He ascends to "the height of Zion," as *Jeremiah* xxxi. 12, speaks of it, or "the height of Israel," to use *Ezekiel's* term, xvii. 23, xx. 40, leading captive captivity, that is, leading a large body of captives captive, and receiving tribute "in the man," that is, "among the men." We must guard ourselves against the supposition that

Thou didst capture captivity,
could signify,
Thou didst capture captors.

The phrase is found in *Num.* xxi. 1, *Deut.* xxi. 10, *Judges* v. 12, *2 Chronicles* xxviii. 5, 11, 17, and simply means to make captives.

The Hebrew word "in the man," "in the 'ādhām," is collective, and means "among men," as in *Exodus* xiii. 2,

Numbers viii. 17, xviii. 15, xxxi. 11, 26, 2 *Samuel* xxiii. 3, *Jeremiah* xxxii. 20, xlix. 15, *Micah* vii. 2, and *Psalms* lxxviii. 60. But St. Paul changes "among men" into "to men," because he has already changed "He took gifts" into "He gave gifts." It has been urged that the verb does mean to take for the purpose of giving. But in *Gen.* xv. 9, "Take for me," which is adduced as an example, the purpose of giving is in the pronoun, and not in the verb.

St. Justin Martyr, recording his conversation with Trypho the Jew in 132 A.D., under the colonnades of Ephesus, quotes the line in xxxix. as

He gave gifts to men,

and again in lxxxvii. as

He gave gifts to the sons of men.

Strangely enough, the Aramaic Targum of the Jews, and the Syriac Peshittā or Vulgate of the Old Testament, apparently made by Jews of Edessa from the Hebrew text before 200 A.D., both read,

Thou didst give gifts to the sons of men.

And Rashi, the great Jewish commentator, 1040-1105 A.D., explained the verb as "didst take that thou mightest give." It is possible, but not probable, that the copies of the Syriac Old Testament were affected by St. Paul's form of the line, as were the Ethiopic and Arabic versions of a later time. On the other hand, the Aramaic Targum of *the Psalms* was written, when Rome and Constantinople were the two capitals of the Roman empire, that is, between the foundation of Constantinople in 329 A.D., and the submission of Rome to Odoacer in 476. And it is not at all probable that it, or Rashi in the eleventh century, was influenced by St. Paul.

Indeed, the departure from the Hebrew is not beyond the reach of homiletic exposition, whether that of the Jewish *haggadáh* or that of the Christian exhortation. The picture of God, represented by Moses in the Targum as ascending to Zion with a train of captive enemies, and as receiving tribute from Gentiles, is naturally completed by His giving that tribute to reward His people.

The Christian adaptation of the scene will describe the ascent of the Messiah to heaven. He will appear as leading His Apostles in His triumph, *2 Cor.* ii. 14, just as a Roman general on such an occasion was followed on horseback by his sons, his lieutenants and tribunes, *Livy* xlv. 40, Cicero, *Against Calpurnius Piso* xxv. 60, in 55 B.C., *Appian* xii. 117. He will also be accompanied by captives in the fallen principedoms and authorities. These He will display boldly, leading them in triumph, *Col.* ii. 15, as the Roman general showed his captured enemies to his fellow-citizens, Horace, *Epistles*, i. 17, 33. Enthroned in heaven, our Lord receives the tribute of faith, hope and love from the faithful, and the homage of every knee and tongue in heaven, on earth, and under the earth, *Phil.* ii. 10, 11. He receives, too, the Divine glory, which He had eternally, *John* xvii. 5, and laid aside from the Christmas of 8 B.C., to the 9th of April, 30 A.D., that is, for thirty-five years and a half, *Phil.* ii. 7. He will receive that glory also, which He has merited by those years, *John* xvii. 24. Further, as St. Peter declared on the Day of Pentecost, He receives and gives the promise of the Holy Spirit, *Acts* ii. 33.

So St. Peter, by including both the receiving and the giving, mediates between the receiving in *Psalms* lxxviii. 19, and the giving in *Ephesians* iv. 8. The gifts, which our Lord had merited for His Church, and literally enough, "took in the man," receiving them in His human nature, He gave to ~~the~~ men for that Church. We are, therefore,

concerned in this passage, not with the gift of sanctifying grace, which directly makes men pleasing to God, but with the gifts by which they help others. In such cases, men are but channels, though they may profit indirectly from the graces through the merit of faithful stewardship. None is nearer to God, or dearer to God, because he is an apostle, prophet, evangelist, shepherd or teacher, though the fulfilment of his work may gain him even as much merit as another attains by sweeping a crossing for the love of God.

Much difficulty has been occasioned by the next lines,

Eph. iv. 9. But the [word] "He ascended,"
What is it?

If not that He also descended
Into the lower parts of the earth.

St. Paul is adapting the psalm to the Ascension and Pentecost, and is therefore referring to Messiah's descent. Now Messiah's ascent implied a previous descent. For it is hardly reasonable to explain the descent by Pentecost, as that descent was neither Messiah's, nor implied in the word "ascended." Some, such as Pearson, in his *Exposition of the Creed*, article V., recognise the descent as previous to the ascent, but explain it by the Incarnation. In that case, the descent would be to earth. "The lower parts of the earth" must therefore be interpreted by the genitive of apposition, like the phrase "the city of London," and as meaning "the lower parts, consisting of the earth." Even then, no parallel or confirmation would be found in our Lord's words,

John iii. 13. And no one has ascended into the heaven,
If not He who descended out of the heaven,

The Son of Man,
He Who is in the heaven.

There, the relation is not between the Incarnation and the Ascension, but between the Incarnation, assuming our Lord's human Soul into the Godhead, and the Beatific Vision by that Soul. Nor can *Isaiah* xliv. 23, or *Psalms* lxiii. 9, or *Psalms* cxxxix. 15, be quoted in support. The first two passages use the under or lower parts of the earth as equivalent to Sheol or Hades, the place of departed souls. In both passages, there is a contrast between heaven and that world of souls, precisely as there appears to be in the present lines of the encyclical. The third passage does not help us, as it employs the word poetically of a mother's womb.

In his eleventh homily on this epistle, St. Chrysostom explains the lower parts of the earth as death. It is not, however, the state of death, which forms a contrast to the line,

Eph. iv. 10c. Over-above all the heavens.

It must be the sphere of the dead, as St. Irenaeus, Tertullian and St. Jerome held. Some have attempted to confirm this by representing 1 *Pet.* iii. 18, 19, as a paraphrase of these lines, *Eph.* iv. 9. We have already found reason to accredit St. Peter with knowledge of this Pauline encyclical ; and in reading the striking passage, 1 *Pet.* iii. 17-22, we note coincidences in the phrases, "in order that He might introduce you to God," 1 *Pet.* iii. 18, *Eph.* ii. 18, iii. 12, "at the right hand of God," 1 *Pet.* iii. 22, *Eph.* i. 20, and "angels and authorities and powers having been subjected to Him," 1 *Pet.* iii. 22, *Eph.* i. 21. So it has been urged that the words of the encyclical,

Eph. iv. 9 If not that He also descended
Into the lower parts of the earth,

are paraphrased by St. Peter, when he describes our Lord as

1 Pet. iii. 18. Put to death in flesh,
But vivified in spirit,

19. In which [spirit] also—to the spirits in ward—
He went and proclaimed—

So the phrase, “ the lower parts of the earth,” which *Isaiah* xlv. 23, and *Psalms* lxiii. 9, employ for the Hebrew “ Sheol” and the Greek “ Hades,” would be limited to the prison of those who refused Noah’s preaching, 1 Pet. iii. 20. But the phrase is too large in scope, and its contrast with “ over-above all the heavens,” too wide, to be so limited. Therefore it is hardly possible to interpret 1 Pet. iii. 19 as a paraphrase of *Eph.* iv. 9.

He who descended and won the victory, is He also who ascended in triumph,

Eph. i. 21. Over-above all the heavens,

In the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, this is expressed in a similar form, the language, however, being sacerdotal instead of military.

Heb. iv. 14. [We], having therefore a high priest—a great [one]—
Having passed through the heavens.

And a little later, it is added of Him,

Heb. vii 26. And become higher than the heavens.

As to the distinction between the heavens, we may recall St. Paul’s mention of a third heaven, which he identified with Paradise, 2 *Cor.* xii. 2, 4. But on this subject, the Scriptures speak with a great restraint, unknown to the contemporary Jewish literature and the later Gnostic dreams. It may be that the Babylonians did really imagine a sevenfold heaven, such as was certainly pictured in the later Zoroastrian books. But if we would know what were

the Jewish views, outside those of the Sadducees, while St. Paul is writing this encyclical, we need only take the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, written in its original form between 109 and 105 B.C., and the *Secrets of Enoch*, written in Greek at Alexandria between 1 and 50 A.D. by a Jew, who was therefore a contemporary and fellow-citizen of Philo.

According to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, "Levi," the first and lowest heaven is the empty and gloomy witness of man's wickedness. The second imprisons lawless spirits, and contains fire, snow and ice for the Day of Judgement. The third retains God's avenging armies. In the fourth, thrones and authorities sing hymns to God. The fifth is the home of those angels, who report to the Angels of the Presence. The latter live in the sixth heaven, and obtain pardon for sins of ignorance, committed by just men. The seventh heaven is the Holy of Holies, in which the Great Glory dwells.

According to the *Secrets of Enoch*, the first heaven holds a great sea, and houses the rulers of the stars, snow, ice, clouds and dew, cc. iii-vi. The second is the dark prison of the fallen angels, who wedded the daughters of men, c. vii. The third contains the Garden of Paradise and the Tree of Life, as well as fire, ice and angels of judgement to imprison and punish the wicked, cc. viii-x. The fourth is the sphere of sun and moon ; and in it are found phoenixes and flying serpents, besides angels, a hundred of whom warm and light up the sun, cc. xi-xv. The fifth heaven is the dwelling of the angels, who fell with Satan, but did not wed the daughters of men, c. xviii. The sixth heaven contains seven classes of angels to regulate the sun, moon and stars, and to record the deeds of men, c. xix. In the seventh heaven, there are ten orders of angels, archangels, spiritual powers, lordships, principedoms, powers, cherubim,

seraphim, thrones and the 'ôphannîm., "wheels," Ezek. i. 16., described as "the watchfulness of many eyes." And afar off, there is the Lord on His high throne, c. xx.

Those imaginings, so far from being tributary to St. Paul's thought, represent an unhappy tendency, which he had just condemned in the Colossian church, *Col.* ii. 18. They persisted in the Talmudic Gemara, or commentary, on the Mishnic *Chagigah*, or "Festival-offering," compiled before 500 A.D. There we find on p. 12b, or on pp. 63-66, in Streane's version, an account of seven heavens by Rabbi Simeon ben Laqish, who lived about 260 A.D. The first is Vilon, the Latin *velum*, "a curtain," spread out by day, *Is.* xl. 22. The second is *Raqia'*, "a firmament," for sun, moon and stars, *Gen.* i. 17. The third is *Sh'châqîm*, "clouds," where there are mill-stones to grind manna for the just, *Ps.* lxxviii. 23, 24. The fourth is *Z'bhûl*, "a habitation," containing the heavenly Jerusalem, the heavenly Temple and altar, and Michael as priest, *1 Kings* viii. 13, *Is.* lxiii. 15. The fifth is *Mâ'ôn*, "a dwelling" where angels sing all night, and are silent all day, that Israel's songs may be heard, *Ps.* xlii. 8, *Deut.* xxvi. 15. The sixth is *Mâkhôn*, "a place," where are the stores of snow, hail, dew and storm, *1 Kings* viii. 39, 43, 49. The seventh is *'Arâbhôth*, "deserts." This word had apparently been substituted in *Psalm* lxviii. 5, for *'âbhôth*, "clouds." In the seventh heaven are justice, judgement and graciousness; life, peace and blessing; the souls of the just, the perishable spirits, and the immortal souls yet to be created. And all this is defended by references to *Ps.* lxxxix. 15, *Is.* lix. 17, *Ps.* xxxvi. 9, *Jud.* vi. 24, *Ps.* xxiv. 5, *1 Sam.* xxv. 29, *Is.* lvii. 16, *Ps.* lxviii. 10, 4, *Deut.* xxxiii. 26, *Ps.* xviii. 12. The same tradition is carried on in Dante's predecessors, and culminates in that poet's *Paradiso* of ten heavens; the first of the Moon for those whose vows were blighted,

the second of Mercury for those who loved honour, the third of Venus for those who loved beauty, the fourth of the Sun for theologians, the fifth of Mars for martyrs and crusaders, the sixth of Jupiter for kings, the seventh of Saturn for contemplatives, the eighth of the fixed stars for the Church, the ninth of the celestial hierarchies, and the tenth of the empyrean for the manifestation of the Triumphant Church in the form of a white rose. Beyond the tenth heaven is the Vision of the Blest.

But St. Paul says simply,

Eph. iv. 10. He who descended — He —
Is also He who ascended

Over-above all the heavens,
In order that He may fill all the things.

As before, we have rendered “all things” with the article as “all the things,” the expression implying their unity and their aspect as a whole. But there has been much questioning about the verb “He may fill,” or “fulfil,” or “complete.” No doubt, Jeremiah, xxiii. 24, asks in Jehovah’s name, whether a man can hide from God, who is filling the heavens and the earth. But at present, that reference is irrelevant, for here the filling is the purpose of the ascension, and is connected with the giving of certain spiritual gifts. The line before us really completes two earlier passages. In one, *Eph.* i. 23, our Lord is described as “being filled as to all the things in all [ways].” So He is their goal. And in Him, all the things will be summarised. He is the Centre of the Universal Empire, as Nero of the Roman. But on the other hand, as Nero was the source of authority, influence and force, so, in a supreme degree, is the Ascended Messiah the source of spiritual grace to His Universal Empire. If all the things are filling Him, He also is filling all the things,

St. Paul, commenting on the word "gave," found in the last line of

Eph. iv. 8d. "He gave gifts [*domata*] to men,"

mentions apostles first of all, saying,

Eph. iv. 11a And He,—He gave some [men] indeed as apostles.

As in 1 *Cor.* xii. 28, that term is used in the wide sense, which includes Andronicus and Junias, *Rom.* xvi. 7, and Barnabas, *Acts* xiv. 4, 14; for the appointment of the Twelve preceded the Ascension, which is the point of time in question here.

Then St. Paul points to the prophets :

Eph. iv. 11b. But some as prophets.

These are clearly New Testament prophets, as in 1 *Cor.* xii. 28, and include men such as Agabus, who can on occasion foretell, *Acts* xi. 28, xxi. 11, but ordinarily edify, exhort and console the faithful, 1 *Cor.* xiv. 3, 22, as Judas and Silas, *Acts* xv. 32.

Thirdly, the evangelists are indicated :

Eph. iv. 11c. But some as evangelists.

This is one of the three places, in which they are named in the New Testament. St. Philip the Deacon, who had, in 35 A.D., evangelised the city of Samaria, and baptised the Ethiopian Grand Vizier, went to live at Palestinian Caesarea; and St. Luke, visiting him there in May, 57 A.D., gives him the title of evangelist, *Acts* viii. 5, 38, 40, xxi. 8. Again, in his second epistle to St. Timothy, written in the summer of 66 A.D., St. Paul urges his disciple to "do an evangelist's work," 2 *Tim.* iv. 5. The title is not found in the Apostolic Fathers; but from the three passages in the New Testament, we gather that an evangelist could

preach and baptise, but not confer the gift of the Holy Spirit, *Acts* viii. 16. And so pseudo-Jerome was justified in saying that every apostle was an evangelist, but every evangelist was not an apostle.

Finally, St. Paul mentions shepherds and teachers :

Eph. iv. 11d. But some as shepherds and teachers.

We cannot argue, as some do, that the shepherds and teachers represented a ministry, solely resident, and so distinguished from apostles, prophets and evangelists, as representing a ministry, solely itinerant. St. John, for example, resided in Ephesus, governed the churches of Roman Asia, and travelled into the neighbouring regions, Eusebius, *History* III. xxiii. 1, 4, the Alexandrian Clement, in his tract on *the Rich Man*, xlii, illustrating this by the beautiful story of the reclaimed convert. St. Philip, the evangelist, resided at Cæsarea in Palestine ; and it would appear from the mention in *Acts* xiii. 1, of prophets and teachers at Antioch, that the prophets' stay was not then limited to two days, as later in the *Teaching of the Twelve*, xi. 5.

The title of shepherd is connected with that of bishop by St. Peter, who writes in the spring of 63 A.D., describing our Lord as "the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls," 1 *Pet.* ii. 25. On Saturday, April 30, 57, four years before this encyclical, St. Paul, addressing the Ephesian presbyters at Miletus, connects the notion of their office as bishops with that of a shepherd who feeds his flock, *Acts* xx. 28. But the same pastoral work is required of the presbyters in 1 *Pet.* v. 2. Then again, teachers are connected with prophets in *Acts* xiii. 1, which represents the year 47 ; but they are distinguished from them and from apostles in 1 *Cor.* xii. 28, written in the autumn of 55. Further, the office of teaching is connected with that of a

bishop in 1 *Tim.* iii. 2, written in the spring of 65, and in *Titus* i. 9, written in the autumn of the same year.

There is, however, no confusion when we remember that we are dealing with what has been called the charismatic ministry, that of special gifts for converting, encouraging, catechising, organising, and instructing more fully. Besides the sacramental, sacrificial, legislative, and judicial functions of the Church, there is the communication of special graces through the missionary, the preacher, the catechist, the administrator and the lecturer.

**Eph. iv. 7a, 8c, 9c. Disputed Readings, "the," "and,"
"first of all."**

In presenting the line—

iv. 7a. But to each one of us was given the grace,

some witnesses omit the word "the." The word "and" is prefixed by some to the line,

iv. 8c. He gave gifts to men.

And some add *prōton*, "first of all," to the line,

iv. 9c. If not that He also descended.

In the first case, the article "the" would be represented in a Greek uncial manuscript by H, that is, ē. That would also represent the last letter of the preceding word, *ēdōthē*, "was given." As there is no division between the words in early manuscripts, the final ē and that for the article would come together as HH; and one of them would easily disappear. So the article was dropped from the Vatican B, probably of 331 A.D., from the Claromontanus D and the Moscovian Ob, both of the sixth century, and from four ninth century uncials, the Angelic L, the Porphyrian P, and the twin Western manuscripts, the Augien

F and the Boernerian G. To these, we must add the Armenian version, made after 431, the Alexandrian Euthalius, writing in 458 and represented by a manuscript of 1301, St. John Damascene, between 717 and 741, and the cursives, 1 and lectionary 40, of Cent. x., 108 and 252, of Cent. xiv.

But the rational explanation of the omission and the positive evidence for the letter are more than sufficient. It is found in the Sinaitic Aleph, made at the same time and in the same library as the Vatican B. This is supported by the Alexandrian A and the Ephraem C, both of the fifth century. The ninth century also offers witnesses in the second corrector of Claromontanus D, and in the scribe of Sangerman E, who copies him, as well as in the Moscovian K. To these, we add the corrector of the ninth century Porphyrian P, the cursives, 17, of Cent. ix. or x., 31 and 47, of Cent. xi., 37, of Cent. xv., and 10, of an unknown date. St. Chrysostom, indeed, writing before 398, has the article, and is followed by Theodoret about 423. Origen, if we may trust Cramer's *Caténæ* vi., p. 170, published in 1842, read the article between 203 and 254. And the Alexandrian Cyril found it when he was writing his treatise *on the Right Faith* in 430.

With regard to the prefixing of " and " to the line,

iv. 8c. He gave gifts to men,

we may note that it is not read by the Old Latin, for it is not found in Tertullian, *against Marcion* v. 8, about 208 A.D. This of itself would not prove an Old Latin reading, for Tertullian could translate direct from the Greek. But he is supported first of all by three men, who were contemporaries, St. Hilary, p. 120, who was consecrated for Poitiers in 354, Ambrosiaster, who lived at Rome under Pope Dámasus, 366-384, and Lucifer of Cagliari in Sardinia, who died in 371. And they are in turn sustained

by three Latin versions in the same century, St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate of the Pauline epistles, made in 385 and really a modified form of the Old Latin, the Latin translation of *St. Irenaeus* p. 145, and the Latin translation of *Origen* by Rufinus in 398. To these, we add the Old Latin versions, d, e, f, g, found in the uncials, Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., its copy, Sangerman E, of Cent. ix. and the twin manuscripts, Augien F and Boernerian G, also of Cent. ix. Therefore, we regard the Old Latin as excluding the word, although it is found in Victorinus about 360, and in the Gothic version, made after 341, and affected by the Old Latin after 568.

St. Jerome, in his commentary of 388, agrees with his Vulgate of 385, but at the later date, he represents Origen, as the Old Latin at the earlier. So we may take it that Origen did not read the conjunction, although it is found in his printed text, ii. 753. We hold ourselves the more justified in this, that the word is not found in the Bohairic version, made for northern Egypt about 200 or 250, nor in the Alexandrian uncial A, of Cent. v. Caesarea also excludes it from the Sinaitic Aleph, of 331, and from the *Prophetic Extracts* p. 102, of its bishop Eusebius, who lived between 270 and 340.

That the omission is Western is confirmed by the Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., and the twin uncials, the Augien F and the Boernerian G. That it is also Alexandrian is confirmed by the cursive 17, of Cent. ix. or x. The Armenian version, made after 431, suggests by its omission that the word was not found in the Old Syriac, and to these instances of omission, we may add the cursives, the lectionary 7, of Cent. xii., and 108, of Cent. xiv., together with the printed text of St. Justin's *Dialogue* pp. 39, 87, and the printed text of Cramer's *Caténæ* vi., published in 1842.

Strange to say, the Vatican B, probably of 331, and the Ephraem palimpsest C, of Cent. v., prefix the word "and."

So does the second corrector of the Sinaitic Aleph in Cent. vii. Then we have several witnesses from the ninth century, these including the second corrector of Ephraem C, the second corrector of Claromontanus D, the Porphyrian P, and the Syrian text in the Moscovian K and the Angelic L. K and L prepare us to find it in St. Chrysostom, before 398, followed by Theodoret about 423, and the Damascene after 717. It is in the Syriac Vulgate of 411, and the Harclean Syriac of 616, as well as in the Ethiopic of 600. We find it in the Alexandrian Cyril's *Acts* of the Ephesian council in 431, p. 59, if the printed edition is to be trusted, and in the Alexandrian Euthalius of 458, according to the manuscript of 1301. As we should expect, we find it in the Syrian text of the cursives, 47 of Cent. xi., and 37 of Cent. xv.

Our examination into the right of the article and the conjunction to appear in the sacred text has gained us important information with respect to the next question before us. In both those cases, we found ourselves accepting the testimony of the Sinaitic Aleph, the Alexandrian A and the cursive 17, against that of the Vatican B, the Angelic L and the Porphyrian P. The same choice is offered us with regard to the word *prôton*, "first-of-all," which the latter group insert in

Eph. iv. 9. But the [word] "He ascended,"
What is it?

If not that He also descended *first-of-all*
Into the lower parts of the earth.

No question of doctrine is involved for us, who explain the descent as previous to the ascent. But the word *prôton*, "first-of-all," has the appearance of a gloss. And this is confirmed, not only by the superiority of the group, \aleph (Aleph), A and 17, to B, L and P, but also, and still more, by a fuller list of the witnesses on each side.

First of all, we may ask what is the testimony of the Old Latin, Alexandria and Caesarea. There can be no question as to the Old Latin. That decidedly rejects the word by Tertullian, *against Praxeas* p. 30, about 209 A.D., by St. Hilary, pp. 120a, 201f, 1077c, about 354, by Victorinus of Rome, about 360, by Lucifer of Cagliari in Sardinia, p. 196, who died in 371, by the Latin translator of *St. Irenaeus* pp. 259, 331, in the same fourth century, by St. Augustine, in his *City of God* xvii. 4, between 413 and 426, and by the Latin version in the Claromontanus d, of Cent. vi., its copy in the Sangerman e, of Cent. ix., and the Latin version in the Boernerian g, of Cent. ix. The word is not found in the Amiatinus Vulgate, finished before 716; and in the face of so much Latin evidence, we must hold it a patent interpolation in the Roman Ambrosiaster, about 370, and in the Augien f, of Cent. ix., and in the Clementine Vulgate of 1592.

To the Old Latin, we may add the Western uncials, the Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., its copy in the Sangerman E, of Cent. ix., and the twin manuscripts, the Augien F and the Boernerian G, of Cent. ix.

Now we would turn to Alexandria. St. Clement, head of the school there about 189, quoting his contemporary, Theodotus of Byzantine, p. 969, omits the word. It would appear that Origen also does so. It is not found in his quotations, when he is commenting on *John* xix. 20, 21. And further, it is not found either in St. Jerome's commentary, written in 388 under the influence of Origen's works, or in the Latin translation of *Origen on Ezekiel* iii. 358, made by Rufinus in 398. Nor is it found in the Bohairic version, made for northern Egypt about 200 or 250, in the Sahidic version for southern Egypt, in the Alexandrian Cyril's *Acts* of the Council at Ephesus in 431, or in the Alexandrian Euthalius in 458, according to the manuscript of 1301, or in the Ethiopic version about 600,

To these we add witnesses of prime importance in the Alexandrian A and the Ephraem C, both being uncials of the fifth century. This would also be the proper place to adduce the Moscovian Ob, if we could say definitely that its text is Alexandrian. We certainly can add here the cursives, 17, of Cent. ix. or x., and the corrector of 67, a manuscript written in Cent. xi.

Origen may speak again for Cæsarea, where he founded his school in 231. A hundred years later in 331, as we may suppose with great probability, the Sinaitic Aleph lay in the Caesarean library; and like Origen, bore witness against the word. Eusebius was bishop there at the time; and he also, in his *Prophetic Selections* or *Extracts* p. 101, omits it, according to the printed text, though the printed text of his *Demonstration* p. 260a, presents it.

We may note that the word is not found in the eleventh century cursives, 46 and 73, or in the text, according to Cramer's *Caténæ* of 1842.

In St. Chrysostom's homily, commenting on the verse before 398, he inserts the adverb when he formally quotes the passage, but omits it on the second occasion. In the former proceeding, he is followed by Theodoret, about 423, and the Damascene, between 717 and 741. In the latter, he is again followed by Theodoret, and also by Œcumenius about 600.

So much would suggest that the word is really a Syrian variant. In this opinion, we are confirmed by its presence in the Syrian uncials of the ninth century, the Moscovian K and the Angelic L, and in most cursives, as for example, 47, of Cent. xi., and 37, of Cent. xv.

It is also found in the Gothic version, made after 341, the Syriac Vulgate of 411, the Armenian version, made after 431, the Harclean Syriac of 616, the second corrector of Sinaitic Aleph, in Cent. vii., the Constantinopolitan

and second corrector of Ephraem C, and the Porphyrian P, both of the ninth century. But strange to say, and originating another problem, in connection with that uncial, we find the word in the Vatican B, probably of 331.

Eph. iv. 12-14. The Ideal of the Church.

Having spoken of the grace given to each one of us, *Eph.* iv. 7, and having illustrated it by the gifts of apostles, prophets, evangelists, shepherds and teachers, St. Paul proceeds to describe the ideal of the Church, as that of a fullgrown Man, whose Head is the Messiah.

When we read the fourteen lines of the passage, we note their strange arrangement. Our Lord, says the Apostle, gave such gifts

**Eph. iv. 12. Toward the perfection of the holy [ones]—
Unto a work of ministry,
Unto building of the Body of the Christ—**

**13. Until we all attain—all the [men]—
Unto the oneness of the faith [in]
And of the full knowledge of the Son of
God—**

**Unto a fullgrown man—
Unto [the full] measure of [the] stature
Of the fulness of the Christ—**

**14. In order that we may be no longer infants—
Being billowed and being twirled
By every wind of the teaching—**

**In the fraud of men,
In craft [with a view] towards the plan of
the wandering.**

Passing over certain obvious difficulties for a moment, we notice that the whole scheme of the passage is presented by the four lines, 12a, 13a, d, 14a, which may be read together. The gifts, says the Apostle, were given,

- Eph. iv. 12a. Toward the perfection of the holy [ones],
- 13a. Until we all attain—all the [men]—
- 13d. Unto a fullgrown man,
- 14a. In order that we may be no longer infants.

The word for “perfection,” *katartismós*, is not found elsewhere in the Greek Testament ; but Galen, the physician of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, 161-180 A.D., will use it of setting a joint. We render it “perfection,” as it implies the result of “perfecting,” this noun being found in 2 *Cor.* xiii. 9. The cognate verb means “to perfect” in 1 *Thess.* iii. 10, 2 *Cor.* xiii. 11, Luke vi. 40, 1 *Pet.* v. 10 ; “to restore” in *Gal.* vi. 1 ; “to mend” in *Matt.* iv. 21, and “to frame” in *Heb.* xiii. 21.

The word for “attain” in the second line will be used by St. Paul of attaining unto the resurrection, *Phil.* iii. 11, and in St. Luke’s record of St. Paul’s speech before Herod Agrippa II., with reference to the attainment of a hope, *Acts* xxvi. 7. There are other examples of its use, but these are sufficient, and sufficiently significant. In the same line, we have rendered the masculine form, *hoi pántes*, as “all the [men],” just as we rendered the corresponding neuter, *ta pánta*, by “all the [things],” the article implying that the individuals should be taken collectively. At the same time, we should explain “all the [men]” of all Christians, as the expression refers to “we” and “the holy [ones],” and not follow St. Jerome in extending it to all men in the world.

The phrase, “a full-grown man,” in the third line, is

doubly noteworthy. The word, which we render "full-grown," is *téleios*, generally translated "perfect," and meaning "finished," as having attained the *télos*, the end, or completion. The word for "man" is *anēr*, distinguished from *ánthrōpōs*, as the Latin *vir*, "a man," from *homo*, "a human being." The word, *anēr*, is sometimes used to distinguish a man from a woman, and sometimes from a small boy, 1 *Cor.* xiv. 20, or an infant, as here, 1 *Cor.* xiii. 11, and the *History* V. xxix 2, of Polybius, who died about 122 B.C. We may regard the word "infant," *in-fans*, "not speaking," as a happy rendering of the Greek word, *nēpiōs*, that is, *nē-ēpos*, "not a word." But St. Paul draws a contrast not only between "man" and "infant," but also between the singular "man," as representing the one Church, and the plural "infants," as representing individual Christians. "The perfect man" is the perfect Body, of which our Blessed Lord is the Head, *Eph.* iv. 15.

Now we may examine the couplets, which St. Paul adds to each of the four lines. If the gifts were given

Eph. iv. 12. Toward the perfection of the holy [ones],

it was

Unto a work of ministry,
Unto building of the Body of the Christ.

The change of preposition from "toward" to "unto," the dropping of the article, and the ideal of ministering set before all Christians by our Lord's example, *Mark* x. 43, *Luke* xxii. 26, and realised by the whole *oikia*, "household," or family of Stephanas, 1 *Cor.* xvi. 15, imply that the ministry here is that of the holy [ones], and not only that of the apostles and others specially mentioned. The couplet, therefore, is dependent on the previous line, and

illustrates the grace given to each one of us, *Eph.* iv. 7. In the second line of the couplet, St. Paul blends the metaphors of growth and building, body and temple. This building of the Body may well be compared with the growth of the Temple in *Eph.* ii. 21. In such a way, the Apostle is able to suggest at once the organic nature of the Church and its office as a habitation of God.

The line,

Eph. iv. 13. Until we attain—all the [men],—

will be completed by the line,

Unto a fullgrown man.

But St. Paul interpolates a note as to the direction, in which that end will be attained, saying,

Unto the oneness of the faith [in]
And of the full knowledge of the Son of God.

The phrase, "the faith of the Son of God," is equivalent to "the faith in the Son of God," as we have already found in *Eph.* iii. 12, confirmed by the references to *Mark* xi. 22, *Gal.* ii. 16, iii. 22, *Rom.* iii. 22, 26, and *Phil.* iii. 9. Here it is a unity of faith and full knowledge, therefore to be attained consciously, and distinguishable from the unity of the Spirit, which is given and to be kept, *Eph.* iv. 3. At the same time, we note that St. Paul changes our Lord's title from that of the Messiah, or Christ, with which he concluded the previous verse, to that of the Son of God. In the synagogues of Damascus, in the year 33, St. Paul had used both titles, preaching our Lord as the Messiah, or Christ, *Acts* ix. 22, and as the Son of God, *Acts* ix. 20. But in 49, writing to the Galatians, he passes from the title

of Christ to the other, precisely as he does in the present passage. There he says,

Gal. ii. 20. I have been crucified with Christ,
But I am living—

No longer I !
But Christ is living in me.

But [as to] what I am living now in flesh,
I am living in faith—the [faith] in the Son of God,

Who loved me,
And delivered Himself on behalf of me.

So here, in *Eph.* iv. 12, 13, St. Paul passes from our Lord's title of Messiah or Christ, and His position as source and goal of life, to His name as Son of God, and His place as Object of faith and knowledge.

To the line and phrase,

Eph. iv. 13d. Unto a fullgrown man,

St. Paul adds a definition, or rather a description of such a man in the supernatural order :

Eph. iv. 13e. Unto [full] measure of stature
Of the fulness of the Christ.

The phrase, " the measure of the stature," will be used by Lucian, *Imag.* vi., between 150 and 175 A.D. But Philostratus, in his *Lives of the Sophists* i. 25, 26, under Alexander Severus, 193-211, A.D., will employ the Greek words, as he may, to mean " the measure of the age." The noun *hēlikia* primarily denotes age, as in *John* ix. 21, 23, and probably in *Matt.* vi. 27, and *Luke* xii. 25 ; but it may mean stature, as in *Luke* ii. 52, and xix. 3. In the present case, its meaning is quite clear through the parallel expression, " a fullgrown man."

That fullgrown man and his stature are explained by "the fulness of the Christ." In 49 A.D., St. Paul referred to "the fulness of the time," *Gal.* iv. 4; in 57, he mentioned "the fulness of the nations," *Rom.* xi. 25; and now in 61, he twice uses the term, "the fulness," with reference to the Messiah, *Eph.* i. 23, iv. 13. In the earlier passage of this encyclical, we found that the fulness of the Christ meant the Church. That meaning fits the context here perfectly, especially in regard to the "full-grown man." It also harmonises well with St. Paul's description of our Lord and His Church, taken together, as "the Christ," *1 Cor.* xii. 12. Therefore, in attaining the unity of faith and knowledge, we all together attain the fullgrown manhood as a collective, not as an individualist, ideal, and realise the ideal of the Church as the fulness of the Christ, the Body which completes Him.

The line,

Eph. iv. 14a. In order that we may be no longer infants,

is to be completed and illustrated by two other metaphors; for the infants, who are not infants in wickedness, but little boys in sense, *1 Cor.* xiv. 20, are compared to boats on the sea, and to dupes among rogues. They are boats, which are

Eph. iv. 14b. Being billowed and being twirled
By every wind of the teaching.

The verb, rendered "being billowed," or "tossed on the billows," is derived from the word for "billow," and will be used of the troubled Ninevites in the *Antiquities* of Josephus, IX. xi. 3, in 93 A.D. The picture of the small boat, swung round and twirled on the sea, needs little comment. It happily describes the movements of those who veer from point to point of the doctrinal compass,

not according to their interest, as the Vicar of Bray, nor according to their convictions, as many a Ulysses of religion, but according to the teaching, which they may hear at the moment.

The dishonesty, which dictates so much false teaching, at once suggests a new figure to St. Paul ; and he pictures those spiritual infants as dupes. For such false teaching is forged, and circulated

Eph. iv. 14d. In the fraud of men,
In craft [with a view] towards the plan of the
wandering.

We must allow that literal rendering to stand for a moment at least, because the second line is the subject of much discussion, and any really intelligible translation must be prefaced by investigation and explanation.

The word for " fraud " is *kūbeia*, " dice-playing," from *kūbos*, the Latin *cubus*, " a cube " or " die," used in the game of dice. The transition of meaning from dice-playing to gambling and cheating needs no elucidation. The word for " craft," *pān-ourgia*, comes from *pan*, " every," and *érgon*, " work," and implies a readiness for anything. It may mean " shrewdness," as sometimes in the Greek Vulgate, *Prov.* i. 4, *Sirach* xxi. 12. But it may mean " craft " in a bad sense, as always in the Greek Testament, *Luke* xx. 23, *1 Cor.* iii. 19, *2 Cor.* iv. 2, xi. 3, and here.

So far, there is no difficulty. But now we meet the much discussed phrase, " [with a view] towards the plan of the wandering." The word, *mēthōdía*, rendered " plan," is found only here and in *Eph.* vi. 11. It is derived from the verb *mēthōdeúō*, " to act by method," which is applied in a bad sense, as in the Greek Vulgate of *2 Sam.* xix. 27, and in the *History* of Polybius XXXVIII. iv. 10, who died about 122 B.C. So the craft, of which St. Paul speaks, is exercised

with a view towards executing a plan. Later, St. Paul will urge his readers to put on God's panoply, that they may be able to stand

Eph. vi. 11. [With a view] towards the plans of the Devil,

the preposition *prōs* being rendered " [with a view] towards," as in our present passage. If we compare the two phrases, we may note that the place of " the wandering " is taken by " the Devil." Now the word *plānē*, " a wandering," connected with *plānētēs*, " a wanderer " or " planet," is regularly used in the Greek Testament, and therefore presumably in this passage, of a wandering, not of a causing to wander. The plan, then, is of some one, who wanders ; so that " of the wandering " is a subjective genitive. And as Abbott urges in his commentary, the phrase implies a personification. We could therefore explain it as " the Wandering's plan." The whole line would then mean that the false teaching is disseminated in craft to realise a plan, which has been made by the false teachers as representing " the Wandering," the Devil. And so, the form of the expression is found parallel to " the desires of the Deceit " in *Eph.* iv. 22, and to " the plans of the Devil " in *Eph.* vi. 11.

Eph. iv. 15, 16. The Corporate Life of the Church.

Having unfolded the Ideal of the Church, St. Paul proceeds to speak of its present corporate life. But before reading the words of the encyclical, it may be well to consider the Colossian verse, which presents them in a similar form. To the Colossians, the Apostle has just spoken of some as heretical,

Col. ii. 19. And not holding fast the Head,
Out of whom all the Body,—

By means of the bands and co-bonds,
 Being fully supplied and being brought together,—
 Grows with the growth of God.

Here the life of the Church is described as that of a body, dependent on its head, receiving its life from God, nourished and united by "bands and co-bonds." The line,

Col. ii. 19b. Out of whom all the Body,

which was completed by the line,

Col. ii. 19e. Grows with the growth of God,

will be reproduced exactly in the encyclical line,

Eph. iv. 16a. Out of whom all the Body,

which will be completed by the lines,

Eph. iv. 16f. Makes for itself the growing of the body
 Unto [the] building of itself in love.

And both passages remind us of our Lord's words about the vine and its branches, *John* xv. 5.

The word *haphē*, "band," was used by Hippocrates, born 460 B.C., and will be explained in Galen's list of medical terms, xix. p. 87, as derived from *háptō*, as meaning "I fasten," and not "I touch," or "I set on fire." We have already, in *Eph.* iv. 3, rendered the word *sún-desmos* as "co-bond." It had a technical sense among medical writers, Galen, *Works* iv. 369, about 170 A.D., explaining it of "ligaments."

The present participle, rendered "being fully supplied," has a long history. First, there was the form *chōrós*, a chorus of dancers or singers. Then came the *chōr-ēgós*, the chorus-leader. Hence arose the verb *chōr-ēgē-ō*, "I

lead a chorus." These two words, "chorus-leader" and "to lead a chorus," came to be used of the man who paid for the chorus and supplied the means for an Athenian drama when the State required him as a citizen to do so, *Demosthenes* 496, 26. As in the case of mayoral offices among ourselves, the citizen proved his generosity by lavish expenditure; and so both noun and verb became suggestive of abundant provision. Then the reference of the words was extended to payment for anything, as the English expression "to pay the piper" has now a very wide application. The Greek verb, therefore, came to mean simply "to supply," though there was an element of generosity implied.

At a later time, the preposition *epi* was prefixed; and as this suggested an addition, the compound verb was employed to mean "to supply fully." It certainly has such a meaning in one of Grenfell and Hunt's *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 282, 6, written between 30 and 35 A.D. In this document, a man complains of his wife's desertion, though "I fully supplied her with what things were suitable, even beyond my power." It has indeed been argued, on the other hand, that the prefix *epi* originally implied "to" and a particular application of the verb, which therefore meant "to supply to," Moulton's *Prolegomena* 113. And it is suggested that the prefix was probably retained for the greater fulness of sound. In the Greek Testament, the simple verb is found in 2 *Cor.* ix. 10, 1 *Pet.* iv. 11, of God's supplying strength to him who ministers, and spiritual seed to the sower. The compound verb is used in *Gal.* iii. 5, of God's supplying the Holy Spirit, in 2 *Pet.* i. 5, of the Christian's supplying virtue, in 2 *Pet.* i. 11, of God's supplying faithful Christians richly with entrance into our Lord's eternal kingdom, and in 2 *Cor.* ix. 10, where the simple form also is found, of God's supplying natural seed and

bread. In all these cases, the verb, in both its simple and compound form, implies abundance. And therefore, its compound form at least ought to be rendered as "to supply fully."

The present participle, rendered "being brought together," is a compound of *sun-*, or *syn-*, "together," and *bibázō*, "I cause to go up," the causative form of *bainō*, "I go." In the passage of the encyclical, which we are about to consider, St. Paul applies it to the members in our Lord's Mystical Body, and uses it, as suggestive of persons, to supplement the present participle, "being conjoined," more suggestive of stones. So by the two words, he hints of a Temple, built of living persons.

It has indeed been more than hinted that

Col. ii. 19d. Being fully supplied and being brought together,
cannot be consistent with

Col. ii. 19c. By means of the bands and co-bonds,

for these compact, but do not nourish. We have, however, learned enough of St. Paul, and the study of the *Apocalypse* teaches us sufficient of St. John, for us to know that such figures of speech were not elaborated by those Apostles with the preciseness and minute exactitude of a modern minor poet.

We have read that passage, dictated in medical language to the Colossians, ii. 19. It was uttered in the presence of a medical man, St. Luke, *Col.* iv. 14, whose own work bears traces of his medical studies, *Luke* iv. 23, 38, viii. 44, xi. 46, xiv. 2, xviii. 25, xxi. 34, *Acts* iii. 7, viii. 7, ix. 33, xiii. 11, xv. 39. We must now study its form, as it is reproduced in the encyclical. And, first of all, we note its two key-words, "increase" and "love." The phrase, "in love,"

concludes the first line and the last, as it concludes sentences in *Eph.* i. 4, iii. 17, v. 2, and is indeed characteristic of the epistle.

Eph. iv. 15. But being true in love,
We may grow unto Him—[as to] all the
[things]—

Who is the Head—Christ—

16. Out of whom all the Body—

Being conjoined and being brought together
By means of every band of the full-supply—

According to [the] activity in measure
Of each one part—

Makes for itself the growing of the Body
Unto [the] building of itself in love.

The verb “being true” may be used of speaking truth. But just as *kūbeúō* means to play with cubes as dice, and *douleúō*, to be a *doûlos*, or “bondman,” so *alētheúō* means to be *alēthēs*, “true,” or to act truly. And this sense satisfies the word on its only other occurrence in the Greek Testament,

Gal. iv. 16. So that I have become your enemy,
Being true to you.

Some difficulty has been found in the line,

Eph. iv. 16c. By means of every band of the full-supply.

Wordsworth and Ellicott, in their commentaries, rightly explain the genitive, “of the full-supply,” as defining the use and purpose of the “band,” as “of the service,” in *Heb. ix. 21*, defines the use and purpose of the “vessels.”

Indeed, there is no real grammatical difficulty. And when it is objected that supplies of nourishment are not communicated by the bands and ligaments, we again point out that St. Paul, like St. John and ancient writers in general, was not careful of preciseness in such details. In the last line of this very passage, he uses the word "building" of a body's growth.

Nor is there any difficulty in the two lines,

Eph. iv. 16d. According to [the] activity in measure
Of each one part—

The activity proceeds from a power, and produces an effect. In physiology, we should speak of it as a function. Then, the activity in measure" means the "activity in due measure" or the "proportionate activity." And the proportionate activity of each part represents that internal harmony, which is the third, as unity is the first, and diversity the second, great feature in St. Paul's picture of the Church.

Finally, we note that in *Eph.* iv. 16f, the verb "makes" is in the middle or reflexive form, and means "makes for itself." So it implies that the whole body acts by each of its members, and benefits by the activity of each. This the Apostle had already, in the autumn of 55, taught the Corinthians, saying,

1 Cor. xii. 26. And whether one member suffers,
All the members co-suffer.

Or a member is honoured,
All the members co-rejoice.

Eph. iv. 16e. A Disputed Reading, "part."

The passage, which we have just quoted from 1 Cor. xii. 26, may have had an influence on the text of the passage in the encyclical. In the latter, we read of "each one part,"

and in the former, of "the members." To change "of a part," *mérours*, into "of a member," *mélous*, needs but the changing of the *r* into *l*. This might easily be done by a Greek-speaking scribe, whether influenced by a reminiscence of the passage in *First Corinthians*, or through misreading the word, or very easily indeed through mistaking the sound, if he wrote at dictation.

First of all, we note that the Neutral text, represented by the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican, both probably of Caesarea and the year 331, reads "part."

Then it is undoubtedly the reading of the Old Latin, for it is found in Victorinus and Ambrosiaster at Rome about 360, in Lucifer of Sardinian Cagliari, who died in 371, in the Old Latin versions, and the latinised Greek of Claromontanus D, made in Cent. vi., the Sangerman E, copied from it in Cent. ix., and the twin uncials, the Augien F and Boernerian G, of Cent. ix., in the Latin translation of St. Irenaeus, p. 270, made in the fourth century, and in the Gothic version, made after 341, but affected by the Old Latin after 568.

In the absence of manuscripts, it is difficult to decide upon the Old Syriac reading. The Armenian version, made after 431, often contains Old Syriac readings; and this, together with the Harclean Syriac of 616, reads "part." But the Syriac Vulgate of 411 and the Schaafian edition of 1708, have "member."

But we may regard the Syrian text as presenting "part." It may reasonably be questioned whether we have Chrysostom's real reading in "member," as that word is not given by Theodoret, about 423, or Damascene, between 717 and 741, and only in the margin of Theophylact in 1077. But in any case, "part" is read by the Syrian uncials, the Moscovian K and the Angelic L, both of Cent. ix., by the Ethiopic version of 600, by the Greek cursives, 47, of

Cent. xi., and 37, of Cent. xv., as against the two sixteenth-century cursives, 14 and the margin of 66.

The Alexandrian text is left. The Moscovian Ob, of Cent. vi., and the Porphyrian P, of Cent. ix., with the cursive 17, of Cent. ix. or x., and the Alexandrian Euthalius of 458, according to the manuscript of 1301, read "part." It would be interesting to know what Origen read. One of his disciples, St. Basil, iii. 8, consecrated in 370, read "part," according to all manuscripts, in spite of the printed edition.

But another of Origen's disciples, St. Jerome, read "member." But as he so edited the Latin Vulgate three years before, in 385, rejecting the Old Latin, he may have read "member" under other influence than Origen's. That reading, however, seems to have originated in Alexandria. We find it in the Bohairic version, made for northern Egypt about 200 or 250, and in the two uncials of Egypt and the fifth century, the Alexandrian A and the Ephraem C. The Alexandrian Cyril, in his commentary on *St. John* p. 999, composed between 417 and 428, is in accord with the two contemporary uncials, according to Pusey's uncritical edition of his works; and it may well be that he is to be numbered with those who were misled by the Alexandrian misreading.

Eph. iv. 17-19. The Old Man.

It would seem natural that St. Paul should pass from the Ideal of the Church as a whole, *Eph.* iv. 12-14, and the harmonious inter-relation of its members, iv. 15, 16, to the personal holiness of each individual. At the same time, such a change of subject will be a resumption of his intention at the commencement of the chapter, when he proposed to argue from the doctrinal facts, which he had

taught, to their practical consequences in conduct. The word, "therefore," which he now uses, as in *Rom.* xii. 1, *Col.* iii. 5, 12, indeed implies such a moral consequence, and at the same time, it recalls the "therefore" with which he set out at the beginning of the chapter. And now he will explain Christian holiness in a twofold way: first of all, negatively, in reference to "the old man," which they had discarded, *Eph.* iv. 17-19, and then positively, in regard to "the new man," which they have put on, iv. 20-24. So he commences,

**Eph. iv. 17. This, therefore, I say,
And I call you to witness in the Lord.**

He does not say, "I witness," or "testify," *martūrēō*, but "I call to witness," *martūrōmai*. Not he alone, but his readers also must witness now. Both are involved, as both are "in [the] Lord," St. Paul using this phrase thirty-eight times to express a relation of union and communion between the Christian and Him, who has dominion over him.

The subject of the testimony is given in the next parallels:

**Eph. iv. 17c. That you are no longer walking
According as the nations also are walking.**

It is evident that the Apostle does not class his readers among the nations or Gentiles, out of whom they have come, though the word "remaining," or "rest of," *loipá*, has been inserted before the word "nations" by some witnesses. It is also clear that he is speaking of contemporary, and not of primeval nations, when he proceeds, as he did in *Rom.* i. 21-28, four years ago, and in this encyclical, ii. 12, some minutes ago, to describe the Gentile world. Now he passes from the neuter word "nations" to masculine participles, in order to emphasise the personal

and responsible character of the Gentiles and their conduct ;
and he tells how they are walking,

**Eph. iv. 17e. In vanity of their intelligence,
18. Having been darkened in the mind.**

They are therefore suffering from mental illusion through the darkness of their judgement, for vanity here has no connection with pride, but with purpose, as in *Rom. viii. 20*, *Psalms xxxix. 5, cxliv. 4*, and *Ecclesiastes i. 2*. It is illustrated by this passage,

*Rom. i. 21. But they were made vain in their reasonings,
And their uncomprehending heart was darkened,
22. Alleging [themselves] to be wise,
They were stultified.*

In that argument, addressed to the Roman Christians, St. Paul shows how intellectual darkness issued in idolatry. Now he tells how it ended in the loss of supernatural life.

**Eph. iv. 18b. Being estranged from the life of God,
On account of the ignorance which is in
them,
On account of the dulling of their heart.**

There is a question whether the participle "being" belongs to this passage, or to the preceding one. It stands between the two expressions,

Having been darkened in the mind,
and.

Having been estranged from the life of God.

Some would join it to the former, which would then read,

Being darkened in the mind.

And Westcott urges the rhythm of the sentence in favour of that construction. Armitage Robinson, however, argues in his commentary, that such a construction is very unusual. We also connect the participle "being" with the words that follow it, and hold the construction justified by the parallel passage in the *Epistle to the Colossians*, where we read,

Col. i. 21. And you—sometime being estranged,
And hostile in the mind—

Already, in this encyclical, St. Paul has described the Gentiles, not only as

Eph. ii. 12c. Having been estranged from the commonwealth
of Israel,
And [being] foreigners from the covenants of the
Promise,

but also as

Not having hope
And godless in the world.

And now, we see how perversion of intellect and will follows the loss of supernatural life through culpable ignorance. The estrangement, then, is explained in the second line as due to ignorance; and the ignorance is explained in the third line as culpable and due to the dulling of the heart.

As to the word, rendered "dulling," *pōrōsis*, Armitage Robinson's commentary, pp. 264-274, has excellent references, to which Abbott's quotation from Theodoret should be added. The word *pōrōsis* comes from the verb *pōrōō*, and that from *pōros*, the Latin *tophus* and Italian *tufa*, a light porous stone. Hence, it has been argued that the verb means "to harden." And it is true that medical writers, like Hippocrates, who was born in 460 B.C., did use the verb of a bony formation or of stone in the bladder. But the Egyptian Athenæus, xii. 549, about 200 A.D., in a

quotation from Nymphis of Heraclea, and Ælian, in his *Various History* ix. 13, written under Septimius Severus between 193 and 211 A.D., employ the word of the Heracleian tyrant's flesh, which was so fat as to be dulled beyond sensibility. And the Greek Vulgate uses it in *Job* xvii. 7, to tell how eyes were dulled and dimmed.

In *John* xii. 40 and 2 *Cor.* iii. 14, iv. 4, the word is connected with the verb "to blind." And when we consider the occurrences of the noun in the Greek Testament, we are impressed with the unsuitability of the rendering, "hardening," and the need of some such translation as "dulling," "dulness," or "insensibility." There are three such examples. In *Mark* iii. 5, the Old and the Vulgate Latin render the word as "blindness." The same translation is given by the Armenian and Ethiopic versions. The Sinaitic palimpsest, dating from about 400, and containing an Old Syriac version, reads "deadness." But "hardness" is found in the Syriac Vulgate of 411, according to the Jerusalem manuscript.

The word is explained as "blindness" by the grammarian Suidas, a Constantinopolitan of the tenth century A.D., and by the grammarian Hesychius, an Alexandrian, and probably a pagan, of the year 200 A.D., whose works have been much interpolated by Christian hands. And this explanation is confirmed by the second occurrence of the word in the Greek Testament, *Rom.* xi. 25, where it refers to verse 7 and the verbal form, immediately explained by "a spirit of stupor," "deep slumber,"

Rom. xi. 8. Eyes, that they may not look,
And ears, that they may not hear.

On this, the second occurrence of the noun, it is translated as "blindness" in the Syriac and Latin Vulgates, in the Armenian version, in the Latin translator of Origen p. 639,

in St. Augustine often, in St. Ambrose in 388 A.D., *On the Patriarch Joseph* p. 510, and in the Old Latin versions, which accompany the Greek Text in Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., Augien F and its twin, Boernerian G, of Cent. ix. This is really supported by the *obtusio*, "bluntness" or "dulness," used as a translation by St. Hilary in 354 at Poitiers, and by Ambrosiaster under Pope Dámasus, 366-384, at Rome.

The third occurrence of the noun is in our present passage, *Eph.* iv. 18, where it is rendered "blindness" in the Latin, Syriac and Armenian versions, and in the Syrian Ephraem's explanation, preserved in Armenian. We may compare the phrase, "the *pōrōsis* of their heart," with a line in the first prayer,

Eph. i. 18. [You], enlightened as to the eyes of your heart—

and with the parallel passage in the *Epistle to the Romans*,

Rom. i. 21. And their uncomprehending heart was darkened.

Finally, we note that our line,

Eph. iv. 18d. On account of the *pōrōsis* of their heart,

is followed by a word, apparently suggested by it. This perfect participle, *ap-ēlgēkōtes*, means "having become insensible" and destitute of feeling. Theodoret indeed connects the two words, when he explains the former, *pōrōsis*, dulness or dulling, by the form *an-algēsia*, "insensibility," saying that *pōrōsis* is extreme *an-algēsia*. Therefore, we do not hesitate to retain our version,

Eph. iv. 18d. On account of the dulling of their heart.

As in *Rom.* i. 24, the loss of God, which followed culpable ignorance of Him, is followed in turn by vice. Those

who dulled their own heart's perception, and estranged themselves from the life of God, are now shown as delivering themselves over to wanton sin. In *Rom.* i. 24, 26, 28, it is God, who is said to have delivered them up. But that statement is explained by St. Chrysostom and Theodoret as meaning that God suffered them to fall. Those writers, however, would not represent God as only negatively related to the matter, for St. Chrysostom illustrates the question by a general's departure from a mutinous army, and his disciple, Theophylact, by a physician's abandonment of a disobedient patient. So Cornely, in his fine Latin commentary on the *Epistle to the Romans* p. 94, speaks of God as positively permitting the fall of the apostates by withdrawing His effectual graces.

But we must proceed further, and distinguish two elements in the matter. There is the malice of the sin ; and that is contributed by the sinner himself. By the culpable deadening of his own heart to supernatural influence, he loses supernatural life, and turns from the Creator to creatures, delivering himself up to a life without a conscience or a conscious aim. God delivers him up in judgement by attaching physical consequences to spiritual apostasy. Just as every sin has a temporal penalty in the order of nature, so the abandonment of God involves the intellect and the will in a gradual loss of rational life. The punishment is made to fit the crime. And the man's refusal of subjection to God is followed by a mutiny within, the sensual impulses refusing the control of reason.

The next couplet closes the account of such persons,

**Eph. iv. 19. [As being those] who, having become insensible, delivered themselves to licence
Unto a working of all uncleanness in greediness.**

We have used the expression, "[As being those] who," to make the force of the compound relative explicit. The phrase "having become insensible" represents the perfect participle of the verb *ap-algéo*, compounded of *algéo*, "I feel pain," and *apó*, "from," and so, according to its etymology, meaning to cease from suffering pain. Thucydides, ii. 61, between 424 and 391 B.C., used the verb in the sense of ceasing to grieve. Polybius, who wrote his *History* later, between 142 and 122 B.C., uses the word of ceasing to hope, I. xxxv. 5, of ceasing to care or hope, I. lviii., and of ceasing to care about truth, XVI. xii. 7. As a Greek Testament word, it is rendered "despairing" by the Gothic, Armenian and Ethiopic versions, by the Old Latin in Victorinus and Ambrosiaster at Rome about 360, and in the Claromontanus d, of Cent. vi., its copy, the Sangerman e, of Cent. ix., the Augien f, and its twin the Boernerian g, of Cent. ix. When we look at the Greek columns in those same manuscripts, D, E, F, and G, we see they have been "latinised" and conformed to the Latin columns by a slight change. Instead of reading *apēlgēkōtes*, "having become insensible," they have changed the *gē* into *pi*, to mean "despairing," as the *desperantes* of the Latin, though strictly it would mean "causing to despair."

St. Jerome indeed retained that Old Latin in his Vulgate of 385; but he came under the influence of Origen's works during the next three years; and it is to that influence we may most probably attribute his explanation of the word by "not grieving," in his commentary of 388. In this he also agrees with the Bohairic and Sahidic versions of Egypt, and will be in accord with the Syriac Vulgate or *Pēshittā* of Edessa, when it will be published in 411. Since the word implies the ceasing to feel pain, it can be applied to grief or hope or any other emotion. And since it is used of

ceasing to care, we can explain it as the becoming morally insensible.

We have rendered *asēlgeia* in the same line as "licence." It implies "insolence" in Demosthenes' reference to Philip of Macedon, I *Philippics* xlii. in 352, B.C., and to Meidias, p. 514, in 349, B.C. Aristotle, in his *Politics* V. v. 1, written later than 334 B.C., uses the word of demagogues, who lay informations, or urge the crowd against men of property. The etymology of the word is uncertain, though some derive it from *a* "not," and *sēlgō*, a form of *thēlgō*, "I charm." We must therefore depend on its use alone for its meaning. If we note that use both in the sense of "insolence," as in the instances we have given, and of "wanton sensuality," as in *Polybius* xxxvii. 2, and *Galatians* v. 19, we see its fundamental notion is the spurning of restraint, and is best expressed by "licence," whether sensual or not.

These, who had lost moral sensibility, delivered themselves to licence, that is, to a condition without moral restraint,

Eph. iv. 19b. Unto a working of all uncleanness in greediness.

The word, *ērgāsia*, rendered "working," is not used elsewhere in the Greek Testament, except by St. Luke, xii. 58, *Acts* xvi. 16, 19, xix., 24, 25, who uses it of the energy, or the gain, or a form, of business. In the first of these instances *dōs ērgāsian*, "give diligence," is a Latinism, *da operam*. Hobart, indeed, in his *Medical Language of St. Luke* p. 243, will have it that the word *ergasia* belongs to St. Luke's medical vocabulary; but it is much more probable that St. Luke owes it to the Greek Vulgate, the Septuagint, in which it occurs frequently. In the present passage, St. Paul apparently uses the phrase to express "to work all uncleanness." If he adds "in greediness," it is a striking contrast to the phrase "in love," which he

uses so often in this encyclical. It certainly means a disposition to have more than one's share. The Greek word, *plēon-ēxia*, is etymologically resolvable into *plēon*, "more," and *ēchō*, "I have." The noun and the verb are generally used of avarice in regard to money. But the verb is also used of defrauding others by sensual sin, 1 *Thess.* iv. 6. So we need not introduce the question of gain into the present passage, which is simply and sufficiently explained by such unclean conduct as would satisfy a selfish craving without any consideration for others.

Eph. iv. 17d. A Disputed Reading, "rest of."

St. Paul naturally distinguishes his readers from the "nations," the "Gentiles." Therefore he writes,

Eph. iv. 17c. That you are no longer walking.
According as the nations also are walking.

But this distinction is erased by the insertion of the word *loipá* before the word for "nations," "the rest of the nations," or "Gentiles," evidently implying that the readers were reckoned among the nations.

St. Chrysostom inserts the word in his commentary, composed before 398. He is followed by Theodoret about 423, and by Damascene between 717 and 741, although the Paris manuscript of the latter does not contain the word. This is found in the present form of the Gothic version, made originally after 341, in the Syriac Vulgate, made in 411, in the Armenian version, made after 431, and in the Harclean Syriac of 616. It will be noted that these instances do not take us far from Syrian Antioch and Constantinople.

To them, we must add the second corrector of the Sinaitic Aleph, 8^c, and the second corrector of the Claromontanus D, D^c, both of the seventh century. The third

corrector of the Claromontanus D, D^e, working in the ninth century, upholds the second corrector. Their interpolation is taken over by the Sangerman E, also of the ninth century. The same period produces similar evidence in the Syrian manuscripts, the Moscovian K and the Angelic L, and in the Porphyrian P. The fifteenth century cursive, 37, follows on the same side.

The evidence against the word is overwhelming. Caesarea is definitely against it in 331, to judge by the Sinaitic Aleph and Vatican B, which at least represent the Neutral Text.

Alexandria is against it, as we may see by the Bohairic version, made for northern Egypt about 200 or 250, as well as by St. Clement of Alexandria, p. 69, who was head of the School there from 189 to 202, by the Alexandrian uncial A, in the early fifth century, by the Alexandrian deacon, Euthalius, in 458, according to the manuscript of 1301, by the Moscovian uncial Ob, of Cent. vi., by the cursive 17, of Cent. ix. or x., and by the corrector of the eleventh century cursive 67. This evidence strengthens us in supposing that St. Jerome's omission of the word in his commentary was not due to his omission of it in his Vulgate, but to Origen's influence. The Sahidic version of southern Egypt and the Ethiopic, we may also note, are on the same side.

The West is clearly against the word. It is not known to Victorinus or Ambrosiaster at Rome about 360, nor to Lucifer of Cagliari in Sardinia, p. 196, who died in 371, nor to St. Jerome, preparing his Latin Vulgate of the Pauline epistles in 385. It is not found in the Latin versions of the Claromontanus d, of Cent. vi., the Sangerman e, the Augien f and the Boernerian g, of Cent. ix., nor in the *Speculum*, or "Mirror," m, of Cent. viii. or ix. Nor again is it in the Western Greek Uncials, Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., Augien F, or its twin, Boernerian G, of

Cent. ix. According to Ephraem's commentary, it does not appear to have been known to the Old Syriac. We may add that it was not in the cursive 47, of Cent. xi., or in 10 or 51, of unknown date. So it is excluded by the Neutral, Alexandrian and Western Texts, and shown to be a Syrian interpolation.

In 1 *Thess.* iv. 5, also, St. Paul distinguishes his readers from the Gentiles, whom he describes in the language of *Ps.* lxxix. 6, and *Jer.* x. 25, as the nations, who do not know God. And there, one cursive, 252 of 1316 A.D., inserts the word *loipá*, "rest of," before the word for "nations," suggesting what was contrary to the Apostle's intention.

Eph. iv. 20-24. The New Man.

The Apostle has used the picture of "the old man" to show us what holiness is not. Now, he will use the picture of "the new man" to show us what it is. Therefore, he commences in this fashion :

Eph. iv. 20. But you did not so learn the Christ—

21. (If at least you heard of Him,

And were taught in Him,

According as there is truth in Jesus)—

The supposition cannot imply a doubt, because the Apostle has already assumed much evangelical knowledge on the part of his readers. The words, "if at least," have already been used in *Eph.* iii. 2. There, we suggested that the conditional form may really be rhetorical, not implying any real doubt. And in the present place, we can see the force of this conditional parenthesis. The picture of the new man, *Eph.* iv. 22-24, will be the more impressive, so introduced. For these words before us recall the day,

when the readers first heard Christian preaching, and became Christian catechumens.

Both the verb "learn" and the verb "heard" are used with the accusative or objective case, as if the Christ was the lesson learned and the word heard. But this is characteristic of St. Paul, who speaks not only of proclaiming Christ, *1 Cor.* i. 23, *Phil.* i. 15, of preaching Him, *Gal.* i. 16, and of receiving Him, *Col.* ii. 6, but also of putting Him on [as a garment], *Gal.* iii. 27.

They had heard our Lord preached. They had become catechumens. And they had been taught in union and communion with Him,

Eph. iv. 21c. According as there is truth in Jesus.

The name of Jesus has the article to connect it with the title of the Christ in the previous verse. The change of name is not without reason. The teaching and the preaching which they had heard, were concerned with the Christ or Messiah, whom the Old Testament Scriptures had foretold. Not only was that Messiah fulfilled in Jesus, as St. Paul testified to the Jews in Damascus immediately after his conversion, *Acts* ix. 22, but the Messianic doctrine also came from Jesus. Therefore, that teaching is true,

Eph. iv. 21c. According as there is truth in Jesus,

who could Himself say, "I am the Truth," *John* xiv. 6, so answering Pilate's question, "What is truth?" *John* xviii. 38, and presenting the full contrast to Satan, who has not stood in the truth,

John viii. 44. Because there is not truth in him.

The parenthesis concluded, St. Paul points out what they did learn in learning the Messiah. The next lines are epexegetic or explanatory of that phrase, "You learned the

Christ." It will be best, however, to commence with the passage, which St. Paul has just written at more leisure to the Colossians, and to note how he expresses his thought there. Although that epistle does not unfold the position of the Christ in the Universe, or the position of the Church in relation to the Messiah so fully as the encyclical, yet the presence of nearly eighty coincidences in expression, as well as the similarity in the general tenor of the two epistles, constitutes the one, to some extent, a commentary on the other. And as to the putting away of the old man and the putting on of the new, St. Paul appeals to the Colossians, that they should not lie to one another,

Col. iii. 9. [Since you] put off from yourselves the old man
With his doings,

And [since you] put on yourselves the new [man],
Which is being made fresh unto full knowledge.

The expression, "being made fresh unto full knowledge," suggests that in *the Epistle to the Hebrews* vi. 6, "to make fresh again unto repentance," the verb "to make fresh" being there in its more Attic form. It also recalls the original creation of man in the image of God, *Genesis* i. 26, 27, that image having been lost in the Fall, and being restored in the creation of the new man. It will be well to bear in mind this connection between the new man and the account of the Creation, as the next passage in the encyclical will refer to the account of the Fall. And now we find that St. Paul's readers, in learning the Messiah or Christ, learned

Eph. iv. 22. That you did put from yourselves—
According to the former behaviour—
The old man, which is being corrupted
According to the desires of the Deceit.

23. But that you are being made new with reference to the spirit of your intelligence ;
 24. And that you did put on the fresh man,

Which was created according to [the design of] God

In justice and piety of the Truth.

This passing from an unregenerate to a regenerate state, from a condition of fallen nature to a condition of sanctification by supernatural grace, is so presented as the loss of one personality and the reception of another. In *Gal.* iii. 27, written about the summer of 49 at Syrian Antioch, again in *Rom.* vi. 4, written in January, 57, at Corinth, and yet again in *Col.* ii. 11, 12, written in this spring of 61, here at Rome, St. Paul consistently and definitely connects that putting off the old man with baptism. We note also that the verb is in the middle or reflexive form ; and therefore, we have added the words " from yourselves."

We have rendered *ana-strôphé*, which meant " a turning back " originally, as in the *Antigone* of Sophocles, 226, written in 440 B.C. ; then " a turning about " in or " a dwelling " in a place, as in Aristotle's *History of Animals* IX. xlviii. 5, probably prepared before 334 B.C., or " a dwelling-place," as in the *Eumenides* 23, written by Æschylus in 458. And finally, it is used in the sense of " behaviour " in the *History* of Polybius IV. lxxxii. 1, written between 142 and 122 B.C., in the Greek Vulgate of the Aramaic *Tobit* iv. 19, and in the original Greek of 2 *Maccabees* v. 8. This is the meaning of the word in the Greek Testament, *Gal.* i. 13, *Eph.* iv. 22, 1 *Tim.* iv. 12, *Heb.* xiii. 7, *James* iii. 13, 1 *Pet.* i. 15, 18, ii. 12, iii. 1, 2, 16, 2 *Pet.* ii. 7, iii. 11, and later still in the *Manual* of Epictétus I. ix. 5, committed to writing by Arrian about 140 A.D.

That old man, that unregenerate nature, which St. Paul's readers had put from themselves, is one that constantly grows worse, being corrupted and growing corrupt,

Eph. iv. 22d. According to the desires of the Deceit.

As wandering is personified in *Eph.* iv. 14, and truth in *Eph.* iv. 24, so deception by the Devil is personified here. At the same time, the phrase suggests the primeval deception and fall of man. Indeed, we should only develop the meaning of St. Paul, if we read "the Wanderer" for "the wandering," and "the Deceiver" for "the Deceit," referring both to the Devil.

In *Col.* iii. 10, we read of the new man's being made fresh, and in *Eph.* iv. 23, 24, of the fresh man's being made new. The difference is excellently explained in Trench's *Synonyms* § lx. We may say that *něōs*, "new," implies a brand new thing, something quite young and recently come into existence. But *kainós*, "fresh," has more regard to quality than to time. The distinction is nearly always lost for the English reader by the rendering of both words as "new." It is well, however, to preserve the distinction. At the same time, we should be cautious in explaining "made new" as "re-newed." It may, of course, be implied that fallen man is being restored to the position, from which Adam fell. But the prefix *ana-* can hardly be made equivalent to *re-*, "again." It does, as Abbott points out, imply a change, as in similar compounds. But four times in the ninth chapter of *St. John's Gospel*, 11, 15, 18, 18, the verb *ana-blépō* is used of the man born blind. In his case, it cannot mean "look" or "see again," and ought to be rendered "look up."

The new man, new in existence and fresh in quality, was created

Eph. iv. 24c. In justice and piety of the Truth.

Here the Truth is personified to stand in opposition to the Deceit. Further, the justice and piety, which spring from the Truth, are in contrast to the desires, which spring from the Deceit. They characterise the new spirit. This spirit is not to be confused with the Holy Spirit, nor with a temperament. It is the new personal spirit, which is evidently active in the intelligent apprehension of supernatural truth.

Before concluding this section, it may be worth our while to note the distinction between justice and piety. The nouns are conjoined here and in *Luke* i. 75, as well as in Plato's *Protagoras*, 329c., *Wisdom* ix. 3, and *Clement of Rome* xlviii. The corresponding adjectives are associated in *Titus* i. 8, in Plato's *Theætetus* 176b, his *Republic* x. 615b, his *Laws* ii. 663b, and the *Antiquities* of Josephus VIII. ix. 1. The adverbs are found together in 1 *Thess.* ii. 10. Westcott, in his commentary, p. 68, distinguishes the words as implying, the one, the fulfilment of duties toward others, and the other, that of duties toward self. Some would explain the words by duties toward men and duties toward God. Both *Plato's Gorgias* 507b, and Marcus Aurelius Antoninus vii. 66, are quoted to this effect. The latter says that Socrates was "just" in affairs regarding men, "pious" in those regarding gods. But Trench, in his *Synonyms* § lxxxviii., rightly denies that the words can be limited so in the Greek Testament. Certainly, justice or righteousness cannot there be restricted to human relations. And even according to Plato, in one passage, *Euthyphro* 12e, justice includes piety.

Eph. iv. 24. Justice.

It is the less easy to determine the New Testament idea of justice, because we so often use the word "righteousness" to render *dikaiōsūnē*, when it occurs in the Greek Testament,

and the word "justice" when it is found in Plato or Aristotle. This use of the two English words is made the more misleading by giving them such diverse meanings, that neither the word "justice" nor the word "righteousness" suggests to us all that *dikaiōsūnē* would have conveyed to a Greek speaker in the first century A.D. Then philosophers and rhetoricians spent much time in defining, elucidating and illustrating the subject, which was as familiar to the educated readers of St. Paul's epistles as the Christian principle of charity to ourselves.

Before the year 389 B.C. Plato, then forty years of age and visiting Sicily, had begun to write his *Republic*, with the express purpose of defining *dikaiōsūnē*, the German *Gerechtigkeit*, our "justice" and "righteousness" and "rightness," that is "moral rightness" or "uprightness." To solve his problem, he took Wisdom as the mode of action by which Reason tends towards the highest good of the soul, Courage as the excellence of Impulse, and Temperance as that of Appetite. As these were pictured as having their several seats in the human body, so he also represented them as occupying different seats in the ideal city, which he symbolised as a man. The guardians, moulded of gold, should be characterised by wisdom; the warriors, made of silver, should be marked by courage; and the artisans, wrought of bronze, should illustrate temperance. Then, that which governs and over-rules the whole in man or ideal city, attuning the three elements like three tones to a harmony, is what Plato understands by justice or righteousness, *Republic* 443. Of this just or duly harmonised man, he writes, p. 613, that if he falls into poverty, or diseases, or any other of the things, which seem to be bad, these will accomplish some good for him, alive or dead. For that man will never be neglected by the gods, who is eager to become just, and

by practising virtue, to be made as much like a god as is possible for a man.

So to Plato, justice or righteousness was the all-inclusive virtue, the health of the soul, and the harmonious activity of the most excellent human functions. As such it involves and regulates wisdom as opposed to folly, courage as opposed to cowardice, and temperance as opposed to intemperance. And it was this Platonic scheme, which influenced the Hellenist Jews. Therefore the *Wisdom of Solomon* says,

Wisd. viii. 7. And if anyone loves Justice,
The toils of this [Justice] are virtues.

For she teaches temperance and prudence,
Justice and courage.

Than which things nothing is more useful
In life to men.

We note that the writer substitutes prudence for wisdom, as Plato himself did in his later writings. It is very probable that the Stoics acted as intermediaries in this case, as prudence is accorded such an eminent position in the preceding verse, *Wisd.* viii. 6. We can hardly exaggerate the influence of Plato's scheme on the Hellenist Jews. The Alexandrian Philo, about 40 A.D., in his *Allegories of the Sacred Laws* I. xix., explained the four rivers of Eden as prudence, temperance, courage and justice. The author of *Fourth Maccabees*, who appears to have written before 40, A.D., and was certainly conversant with the Stoic philosophy, bases the philosophical part of his work, 4 *Macc.* i. 13-iii. 18, on the four cardinal virtues, prudence, justice, courage and temperance, which are named in i. 6, 18. In V. 23, 24, *eusēbeia*, "reverence," is substituted for "prudence."

It is necessary to lay stress on these things, if we would

appreciate the use of the term "justice" or righteousness" in the Greek Testament, for our own thought has been more influenced by Aristotle than by Plato. Now Aristotle left the *Nicomachean Ethics* unfinished at his death in 322 B.C.; and the fifth book, which is devoted to the question of justice, belongs to the *Ethics* of his disciple, Eudémus of Rhodes. None the less, we may regard that treatise as representing the master's lectures.

In Aristotle's view of "universal justice" as implying a regard for law and right generally, and as practically equivalent to complete virtue, there is the Platonic conception of justice or righteousness as the basis and harmony of all ethical virtues. He even quotes the popular proverb, found indeed in *Theognis* 147, born at Mégara about 540 B.C., and also attributed to Phōcylides, born at Miletus about 540 B.C., that

Every virtue is contained in justice,

Nic. Ethics V. i. 15. But he emphasises "particular," or "civil justice," as a regard for equality. This particular justice he divides into distributive justice, which gives goods to the citizens in geometrical proportion, the honours given being in proportion to the men, and corrective justice, which compels the wronger to right the wronged in arithmetical proportion, the requital being exactly as the loss. In this introduction of numerical values, Aristotle appears to have been influenced by the Pythagoreans, though he had little enough sympathy with their devotion to numbers.

It is easy to see that Aristotle has influenced European views on the question of justice. The *Institutes* of Justinian the First, I. i. 1, published in 533 A.D., defined justice as a constant and perpetual will to render his right to each one. Aristotle took another step, which increased the distance between him and New Testament doctrine. Plato, as we

have seen, presents the natural virtues, and St. Paul, the supernatural virtues, *Gal.* v. 19-22, as the opposites of vices. Aristotle places natural virtues as the golden mean between vices. In this Aristotle is hardly amenable to Kant's accusation, that he made a merely quantitative difference between vice and virtue. But he himself elsewhere, *Nic. Eth.* II. vi. 17, acknowledges in effect that this formula of the mean does not adequately express the good of virtue. The New Testament, however, regards virtue as goodness, the moral standard being one of perfection, and not one of pleasure, happiness, or law.

So far we have gained a view of what *dikaiōsúnē* would mean to a Hellenist or Greek-speaking Jew of the Dispersion. But the word was charged with a meaning, derived from a Jewish source, when it took the place of the Hebrew *ts'dhāqáh* or *tsédheq*, these forms being apparently synonymous. Now, in the Old Testament, those Hebrew words imply a blameless condition, such as that of Noah *Gen.* vi. 9. The judge of such a condition may be the legal authority, *Deut.* xxv. 1, or public opinion, *Isaiah* v. 23, or God, *Deut.* xxiv. 13. So balances, *Lev.* xix. 15, sacrifices, *Deut.* xxxiii. 19, paths, *Ps.* xxiii. 3, and gates, *Ps.* cxviii. 19, are described as "of justice," because their use does not involve any blame. Such blamelessness is what God demands, *Is.* v. 7, loves, *Jer.* ix. 24, and will see in the Messianic kingdom, *Is.* ix. 7. It may be communicated, for *Isaiah*, playing on the word, says,

Is. liii. 11. Just, My Servant, will make the many just.

And it implies a right relation to God, who therefore regarded Abraham's implicit trust and act of faith in Him as justice, *Gen.* xv. 6.

Now, such blamelessness is not a negative or passive excellence. It is the fulfilment of God's will. Because the

Mosaic Law represented that Divine will, justice or justness, righteousness or up-rightness, consisted in delighting in that Law, meditating upon it, *Ps.* i. 2, and fulfilling it all, *Deut.* vi. 25. No doubt, this became difficult, when the Law was presented as 248 commands and 365 prohibitions, the total number 613 being equivalent to that of the letters in the Decalogue. It became burdensome, when the Pentateuch was supplemented by the *Mishnah*, or Oral Law, the traditional law, said to have been delivered orally by Moses on Sinai, and the sayings of the scribes. Such regulations were designed to "fence" the Law, by keeping feet farther from the forbidden path. It was as if men were forbidden to walk on the side of the road, lest they should offend by walking on the grass. But we must not overlook the fact that devotion, enthusiastic and heroic, to the Law, as the expression of God's will, made justice or righteousness synonymous with all moral excellence. And here the Platonic conception of natural justice was found harmonious with the Jewish conception of supernatural justice.

Since justice or righteousness stood for all virtue, and expressed God's will, it could, as in Plato's *Republic* p. 613, be regarded as an attribute of God Himself. So He reveals Himself. So He acts through all history, and over all the world. So He redeems men. So He is the final goal for all, and holds the full and final dominion over all. It is in Him, that all the seed of Israel will be just, *Isaiah* xlv. 19.

Our Lord pronounces those blessed, who hunger and thirst for justice, or are persecuted for its sake, *Matt.* v. 6, 10. He shows the meaning of the term by describing the Christian ideal in two ways. First of all, He says,

Matt. v. 48. You therefore will be perfect,

As your Father, the heavenly [Father], is perfect.

AA

And again, He commands,

Matt. vi. 33. But be seeking first the kingdom
And His justice.

Justice, or righteousness, is therefore a standard of moral perfection in the supernatural order. In St. Paul, the righteousness or justice of God may mean His Perfection, including His faithfulness and truthfulness, *Rom.* iii. 5, and His Holiness, *Rom.* iii. 25 ; or it may mean that supernatural gift of justice or righteousness, which is from and through [the] faith or faithfulness of Jesus, Messiah, unto faith, that is, unto all, who believe, *Rom.* i. 17, iii. 22. By means of that gift, the believer becomes just, is in supernatural communion with God, and partakes of the Divine Nature, 2 *Pet.* i. 4.

Eph. iv. 24. Piety.

The Apostle associates piety, *hösiötēs*, with justice ; and we have already found other places in which the words, or their cognate forms, are conjoined. We also found the Greek *dikaiōsúnē*, "justice," connected with the Hebrew *ts'dhāqáh*. And now, we may point out that the Greek *hösiötēs*, "piety," is similarly connected with the Hebrew *chēsēdh*. Both these Hebrew words are met in *Hosea* x. 12, and *Jeremiah* ix. 23, according to the Hebrew numbering.

In the Old Testament, *chēsēd* means loyal love and affection, whether on the part of man to man, 1 *Sam.* xv. 6, xx. 8, 1 *Kings* xx. 31, *Hosea* iv. 1, *Micah* vi. 8, or on the part of man to God, *Hosea* vi. 4, 6, *Jer.* ii. 2, or even on the part of God to man, *Deut.* vii. 12, 1 *Sam.* xx. 14, 2 *Sam.* xv. 20, *Ps.* xxv. 10, *Job* x. 12. So in the New Testament, the adjective *hösiōs*, "pious," is used of man's relation to God

in 1 *Tim.* ii. 8, and of Messiah's relation to God in *Heb.* vii. 26, and in a quotation from *Ps.* xvi. 10, both by St. Peter, *Acts* ii. 27, and by St. Paul, *Acts* xiii. 35. It is used of God's relation to man, *Apoc.* xv. 4, xvi. 5. And in the plural, both the Hebrew *chēsēd* and the Greek *hōsiōs* are applied to those Davidic promises, given through Nathan, 2 *Sam.* vii. 13, which expressed God's loyal affection and His loving-kindness toward Israel. In *Isaiah* lv. 3, God appeals to His people, adding,

And I will make an eternal covenant with you,
The loving-kindnesses of David, the faithful [ones].

This St. Paul, at Pisidian Antioch, abridges from its Greek Vulgate as

Acts. xiii. 34. I will give you the loving-kindnesses of David,
The faithful [ones],

that is, those pledged to him by God, who is faithful, 2 *Sam.* xxiii. 5, *Ps.* xviii. 50, lxxxix. 28. And though we have explained the Hebrew *chēsēd* and its Greek equivalent as "loving-kindness" and loyal affection, yet "piety," in its old-fashioned sense, would be a sufficient rendering.

Now "piety," in the sense of loyal and faithful affection, will be found to cover the various examples of the Hebrew and Greek words. The unnatural unions, which are condemned by Plato's *Laws* viii. 858b, as not *hōsiōs*, are opposed to such affection. But in full accord with it was Antigone's crime against the State-enactment in casting a handful of dust upon her dead brother, Sophocles, in his *Antigone* 74, denoting the act by the very word *hōsia*, which we have rendered as "loving-kindnesses" in *Acts* xiii. 34.

If, therefore, the English word "justice" be understood in the full sense of the Hebrew *ts'dhākhāh* and the Greek *dikaiōsunē*, and if "emotion" be understood in the old

sense of that word as loyal and faithful affection, then we may sum up the phrase, "justice and piety" in "benevolence," assuming that Muirhead is right in his *Elements of Ethics* p. 201, when he defines "benevolence" as "justice touched with emotion."

Eph. iv. 25-32. Five Duties Towards Our Neighbour.

In the next division of the encyclical, St. Paul, consciously or unconsciously, has given us ground for supposing two tablets of commandments, the first tablet or table containing five duties towards our neighbour, *Eph.* iv. 25-32, and the second, five duties towards God, *Eph.* v. 1-21. Whether that analysis be accurate or not, the Apostle's emphasis on justice and piety, that is, on moral perfection and loyal affection, is an excellent introduction to the particular commands and prohibitions, which now lie before us.

The passage, which we are about to examine, *Eph.* iv. 25-32, prohibits lying, anger, stealing, foul speech and uncharitableness. We may readily connect the prohibition of false speech with the Decalogue's prohibition of false witness against one's neighbour, *Exodus* xx. 16, *Deut.* v. 20. The prohibition of settled anger and angry hatred comes under the Decalogue's prohibition of murder, *Exodus* xx. 13, *Deut.* v. 17, according to our Lord's extension of that prohibition to anger, *Matt.* v. 22. The prohibition of stealing is directly connected with the Decalogue, *Exodus* xx. 15, *Deut.* v. 19. The prohibition of foul speech is connected with the Decalogue, *Exodus* xx. 14, *Deut.* v. 18, not only for Aristotle's reason, *Politics* IV. (VII.), xvii. 8, that the doing of shameful things is not far from the speaking freely of them, but also because our Lord extended the prohibition of adultery to the indulgence of the desire, *Matt.* v. 28.

To each prohibition St. Paul adds a motive in accordance with the doctrine which he has been expounding. It is not, however, necessarily the primary motive or the foundation of the prohibition.

He connects the series by the word "wherefore" with what has gone before. And here, as in *Col.* iii. 9, 10, he makes the putting off the old man and the putting on the new the reason for putting away lying. Indeed, he has just mentioned the truth, *Eph.* iv. 24, so association by contrast would suggest the lie, this representing here, as in *Apoc.* xxii. 15, all forms of falsehood, though in *Rom.* i. 25, it stands like the Hebrew *shéqēr*, *Is.* xlv. 20, *Jer.* xiii. 25, for an idol.

The first of these Pauline prohibitions runs,

Eph. iv. 25. Wherefore, since you did put the lie from
yourselves,
Be you speaking truth,

Each with his neighbour,
Because we are members of one another.

The connection with what has gone before is maintained not only by the words, "wherefore" and "truth," but also by the second aorist or indefinite past tense of the participle, "put from." This tense and the middle or reflexive form have been used already in *Eph.* iv. 22, of putting off the old man; and in both places, we represent the middle voice by "from yourselves." The positive command is taken from *Zechariah* viii. 16, written in 518 B.C.

Speak you truth,
Each with his neighbour,

the words being quoted from the Greek Vulgate. and the stronger *metá*, "with," being substituted for *pros*, "toward."

It has become a commonplace that the Christian religion, as indeed the Stoic philosophy and the Roman jurisprudence had done in some measure, enlarged and extended the denotation of the word "neighbour" to all men. It began this process consciously and definitely, when its Divine Founder made a Samaritan the neighbour of a Jew, *Luke* x. 36. As to the connotation or meaning of the word "neighbour," there is some ground for Green's statement in his *Prolegomena to Ethics* § 207, that "it is not the sense of duty to a neighbour, but the practical answer to the question, Who is my neighbour? that has varied." But the assertion is not absolutely correct, for that sense of duty depends on the question, *What* is my Neighbour? The answer differs according as the man is considered a member of a tribe, or a member of the State, or a member of the race, or a member of the Christ's Mystical Body. It is in the last of these characters that St. Paul, dealing mainly with the life in the Christian Church, presents the neighbour, saying,

Eph. iv. 25d. Because we are members of one another.

And he has already used a similar expression in *Rom.* xii. 5.

St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, *Secunda Secundae*, question cix., article 3, in answer to the first objection and dealing with the relation of truth to justice, quotes Aristotle's *Politics* I. ii. 9, written between 334 and 322 B.C., to the effect that man is a living being of social character, and then argues that truth is due from each to each, because it is essential to human society. St. Thomas, therefore, in that passage, is considering the neighbour as a member of the human race.

The second prohibition relates to anger, and takes form as an exact quotation from the Greek Vulgate of *Psalms* iv. 5, according to the Hebrew numbering.

**Eph. iv. 26. Be you wrathful,
And be not sinning.**

The Hebrew verb, represented by the Greek for "be you wrathful," is used of anger in *Prov.* xxix. 9, of grief in *2 Sam.* xviii. 33, that is, xix. 1, in the Hebrew text, and of fear in *Isaiah* xxxii. 10, 11. It is the involuntary trembling of the emotion that is in question. And the verb ought not to be rendered "stand in awe," unless it is definitely determined to that meaning by some such phrase as "before God." St. Paul does not introduce the quotation by "it is written," or any similar expression. In fact, he is simply using the well-known words, without any reference to their context or primary meaning, to express his own thought. There is, indeed, an anger, which is involuntary. There is also the wrath of righteous indignation, as in our Lord's case, *Mark* iii. 5. And there is the anthropomorphic attribution of anger to God, that procedure being blasphemous, if anger were essentially evil. Now St. James, i. 19, urges that a man should be slow to wrath, for a man's wrath does not work God's justice. And the Protestant Bishop Butler, in his sermon viii., *on Resentment*, points out that anger becomes sinful, when we imagine an injury, or magnify one, or unjustly attribute to any one an intention to injure, or indulge in excessive indignation, or gratify our resentment by inflicting pain. We may define the matter more exactly by saying that the vice of anger, the desire of vengeance, is deadly sin, but the passion or feeling of anger may be natural and even praiseworthy, though it becomes a venial sin by excess.

Now St. Paul adds

**Eph. iv. 26c. The sun shall not be setting on your [state
of] provocation ;**

27. Nor even be you giving place to the Devil.

It is very probable indeed that the reference to sunset was suggested by the commands to restore a pledged garment, *Deut.* xxiv. 13, to pay a poor man's wages, *Deut.* xxiv. 15, and to bury a man, who had been hanged, *Deut.* xxi. 23, before nightfall. Plutarch, who will be studying philosophy at Delphi six years hence, in 67 A.D., will tell us at a later time, in his treatise *on the Love of Brothers* 488 B, how the Pythagoreans would shake hands, embrace, and be reconciled before the sun set, if anger had drawn them into reproaches. But St. Paul's language is explicable without any reference to that Pythagorean custom. He gives a passive meaning, "a state of provocation," to the word, which is not found elsewhere in the Greek Testament. In the Greek Vulgate, however, this noun is employed several times, as for example in *1 Kings* xv. 30, of the active "provocation," with which Israel provoked Jehovah.

With regard to the line,

Eph. iv. 27. Nor even be you giving place to the Devil,

it has been suggested that the phrase "to give place" is a Latinism; and certainly it is used by Cicero of giving occasion. But the corresponding Greek phrase is found in the Greek version of *Sirach*, made, according to Edersheim, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, in the reign of Euergetes I., but more probably in 132 B.C. There, the phrase is found in the Greek of xix. 17, and in both the Greek and the Hebrew of iv. 5. and xxxviii. 12. In those places, it implies "to give room for action," "to make way and allow scope." So in *Rom.* xii. 19, it means "to leave room" for God's wrath. In the present passage, therefore, St. Paul forbids the provision of occasion and field for the devil to act, such being given him in excessive or prolonged anger.

The third of St. Paul's prohibitions forbids stealing, then prevalent especially among slaves. In the epistle, which

St. Paul has just written to Philemon, he spoke of restitution, and promised to make it himself on behalf of Onesimus, *Philem.* 19. But in the present case, he is concerned with a motive and a course of action, more connected with the putting on the new man than with the putting off the old. So he urges the need of work to provide for those in need. It is such a motive, as would appeal to the new man. And it is such a motive as would be more powerful with noble natures than constraint, though the latter may be necessary in the case of those idle busy-bodies, of whom St. Paul quoted a Jewish proverb,

2 Thess. iii. 10. If anyone is not willing to work,
He shall not even eat.

Now, therefore, he writes in his encyclical,

Eph. iv. 28. He who is stealing, shall not be stealing any
longer,
But rather let him be labouring,

Working the good thing with his own hands,
In order that he may have to distribute [of
his own goods] to him, who has need.

"The good thing" stands contrasted with "the lawlessness," found in the phrase "to work the lawlessness," this expression being quoted in *Matt.* vii. 23, from the Greek Vulgate of *Psalms* vi. 8. The phrase "to work the good" is also used by St. Paul in *Gal.* vi. 10, and *Rom.* ii. 10, and simply means to work at that which is good.

The word *idiaîs*, rendered "his own," in the same line, offers an interesting problem in textual criticism, as we may see presently.

The word "to distribute" is *meta-didōnai*. As in *Rom.* xii. 8, and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*,

“Issachar,” vii., this verb implies the distribution of one’s own goods, that of other persons’ alms being indicated by a different prefix, *dia-didōnai*.

St. Paul’s fourth prohibition has regard to foul speech. He forbids every “rotten” word. The adjective *săprōs*, “rotten,” is derived from the second aorist or indefinite past tense in the passive of *sēpō*, “I mortify,” or “make rotten and putrid.” It is used of a tree in *Matt.* vii. 17, 18, xii. 33, *Luke* vi. 43, of fruit in *Matt.* xii. 33, *Luke* vi. 43, and of fish in *Matt.* xiii. 48.

The words, “good” and “need,” used in the preceding prohibition are still in the Apostle’s mind. Together with the frequent metaphor from building, they will serve again in the expression of his thought. So he dictates,

Eph. iv. 29. No rotten word shall proceed forth out of your mouth ;
[But speak] if [there is] any good [word,
effectual] toward building [in accordance
with the requirement] of the need.

It is, of course, building in its moral and metaphorical sense, that is in question. Yet, if we substitute the synonymous word “edification,” the connection of this passage with others may escape us. As to the word “need,” we retain it, to preserve the connection with *Eph.* iv. 28. We might, however, have justified the rendering “business” by *Acts* vi. 3, *Titus* iii. 14, or “occasion” by Plutarch’s *Life of Pericles* viii., or “opportunity” by St. Jerome’s commentary, which most probably represents Origen’s view. The sense is clear enough, and is illustrated by

Rom. xv. 2. Each of us shall please the neighbour
 Unto the good toward building,

that is, each of us ought to please our neighbours for the

purpose of their moral and spiritual good, this good being realised in the building or edifying of their souls.

The difficulty of interpreting the word, rendered "need," led to its being supplanted by "faith" in Latin witnesses. This word "faith" is found in the treatise on *the Resurrection of the Flesh* 45, written by Tertullian of Carthage about 210 A.D. Then it is taken up by St. Cyprian, who became bishop of Carthage in 248. It was natural that he should follow Tertullian, for St. Jerome tells us in his work on *Famous Men* c. 53, that every day St. Cyprian would read in Tertullian's works, saying first of all to his secretary, "*Da magistrum*," "Give me my master." About the year 360, we find the word in Victorinus and Ambrosiaster at Rome. Though St. Basil the Great and his brother Gregory of Nyssa were consecrated in 370, we must not date the appearance of the word in their works by that year. It is read in the former's shorter *Rules* pp. 432, 485, in the Benedictine edition, and the latter's treatise on *Ecclesiastes* vii. 6, p. 727 in Migne's edition. They alone of the Greek Fathers are accredited with the word "faith," and it may well be unjustly. St. Jerome deliberately and carefully rejected the reading, tracing it to a Latin translator's desire for euphony, vii. 632, a, b, in Vallarsi's edition. None the less, it crept into the Fuldensis manuscript of his Latin Vulgate in 540, and even into the Clementine edition of 1592. We are not surprised to find the word "faith" in the Gothic version. That indeed was made soon after 341; but Gothic manuscripts were introduced into Italy during the fifth and sixth centuries, and especially during the Lombards' invasion in 568; and there, they were affected by the Old Latin Version in *Luke* i. 3, here, and in other places. Then, we find the word "faith" in four old Latin manuscripts, the Latin columns in the bilingual manuscripts, Claromontanus d, of Cent. vi., its copy,

Sangerman e, of Cent. ix., and the twin uncials, Augien f and Boernerian g, both of Italy and Cent. ix. We know that the Greek columns of these manuscripts were Latinised, that is conformed to the Latin columns. So we can account for the word "faith" in the Greek. And of the cursives, the eleventh century 46, presents it.

The evidence for "need" and against "faith" is overwhelming. The former word is read in the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, both apparently Neutral, Caesarean, and of 331. The Alexandrian text is clearly on the same side. First of all, it speaks by St. Clement, head of the Alexandrian School from 189 to 202 A.D., in his *Stromateis*, or "Miscellanies," i. 18, 90, p. 371 in Migne's edition. Then we may add Origen, head of the same school from 203 to 231, not so much because we so read him in Cramer's *Caténæ* vi., p. 184, of 1842, as because we trace his influence on St. Jerome's commentary *on the Ephesians* in 388. To these we add the Bohairic version, made about 200 or 250, and the Alexandrian Euthalius in 458, according to the palimpsest of 1301. On the same side, there is the Sahidic version of southern Egypt, the Syriac Vulgate of 411, the Armenian after 431, the Ethiopic of 600, and the Harclean Syriac of 616. We have already given St. Jerome's opinion; and this is retained in such manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate as the Amiatinus of 716, the Toletanus of the same century, and the Demidovianus of Cent. xii. or xiii. The word "need" is also found in the second corrector of the Claromontanus D, who worked in the ninth century, in the first corrector of the ninth century Sangerman E, and in the ninth century manuscripts, the Porphyrian P, and the two of Syrian type, Moscovian K and Angelic L. But it is clearly not a Syrian reading, and therefore, it is confirmed by its presence in St. Chrysostom, before 398, Theodoret, about 423, and the Damascene,

between 717 and 741. We may add that it is also found in the cursives, 17, of Cent. ix. or x., 47, of Cent. xi., and 37, of Cent. xv.

But what is of most interest in the reading is the question of its origin, especially as the Alexandrian Clement wrote the phrase "unto building of faith" in the very commencement of his *Pedagogue* or "Instructor," before 195 A.D. It has been suggested that the wrong reading, "building of the faith," is connected with a wrong reading in 1 *Tim.* i. 4. There, the true reading is "God's stewardship, which is in faith." But "stewardship," *oikōnōmian*, has been supplanted by "building" in some witnesses. This appears as *oikōdōmēn*, in the preface of St. Irenaeus, according to Epiphanius, about 368, and in the Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi. That is changed again into *oikōdōmian* by the ninth century corrector of the Claromontanus D, D^c, and the eleventh century cursive 192. The Latin form, *ædificationem*, appears in Ambrosiaster at Rome, between 366 and 384, in the Latin Vulgate in 385, in the Latin translation of St. Irenaeus in the same fourth century, in the Latin columns of the Claromontanus d, of Cent. vi., and the ninth century twins, Augien f and Boernerian g, and the *Speculum* or "Mirror," m, of Cent. viii. or ix. From some Latin source, the word "building" passed into the Gothic version, into the margin of the Harclean Syriac, and into the Schaafian edition of the Syriac, printed in 1708.

It would therefore appear that the word "stewardship" was supplanted in some Western Texts of 1 *Tim.* i. 4, by "building." The latter word is consequently connected with "faith." Then, the word "faith," through its association with "building," supplanted "need" in Western Texts of *Eph.* iv. 29, and so obtained a certain currency.

The "building of the need" is explained clearly enough

by St. Jerome as edification according to the requirements of place, time and person. Further, the contrast in the lines is between a word, which is passively corrupted, and one, which is actively beneficial. So there is no reference to the "inactive," or idle, "utterance," which the Day of Judgement will weigh as an expression of the heart's inward thought, *Matt.* xii. 36. But there is a reference to what St. Paul has just written to the Colossians,

Col. iv. 6. Your word [shall be] always in grace,
Prepared with salt,

[So as] to know how you must
Answer each one.

The metaphorical mention of salt was common among the pagans, who often narrowed the figurative application to indicate wit. St. Paul adopts it here to distinguish uncorrupted speech from corrupted or "rotten." So the figure depends on salt as a preservative, not as a flavour. Therefore "grace" in this Colossian text, and in *Eph.* iv. 29c, need not be understood as that which gratifies or pleases. The morally good word is to be uttered,

Eph. iv. 29c. In order that it may give grace to those
who hear.

Grace is connected with speech in the Hebrew text of *Psal'm* xlv. 3, where it is said to the Messianic king,

Grace was poured into Thy lips,
and again in

Eccles x. 12 The words of the mouth of a wise [man are]
grace,

these words of the Preacher being recalled in

Sirach xxi. 16. But on the lips of a comprehending [man] will
be found grace.

If we consider these instances, and our Lord's "words of grace" in the Nazareth synagogue, *Luke* iv. 22, we may see that they would suggest more to a Jew, with his intense moral earnestness and his genius for religion, than to a pagan and artistic Greek. Origen saw this, for in his *De Principiis* IV. i. 5, or "First Principles," written about 230 A.D., he proves that grace had been poured on our Lord's lips by the way, in which the world was filled with His teaching and with the worship of God through Him. Therefore, we hold that grace in this line of the encyclical means more than charm. In this, we are fully justified, not only by St. Paul's use of the word in other passages, but even by pagans, for Æschylus, in his *Prometheus* 822, written before 458 B.C., and Sophocles, in his *Œdipus at Colonus* 1489, brought out by the younger Sophocles in 401 B.C., use this very phrase as meaning to confer a benefit.

The motive then of the morally good speech is the communication of grace. And St. Paul proceeds to connect the prohibition of foul speech with the doctrine of the epistle by adding,

Eph. iv. 30. And do not be grieving the Spirit, the
 Holy [Spirit] of God,
 In whom you were sealed unto a day of
 redemption.

The words are often and rightly quoted as a Scriptural testimony to the personality of God the Holy Spirit. They have also been quoted as implying a distinction between the venial sin of grieving the Holy Spirit, this being represented as a continued act, and the deadly sin of quenching the Spirit, 1 *Thess.* v. 19, that figure of speech referring to the Pentecostal flames, *Acts* ii. 3. So St. Chrysostom interprets the passage in the *Epistle to the*

Thessalonians, saying at the end of his fiftieth homily on *St. John*, that "if we will, we shall strengthen that flame, which we once [in baptism] received by the grace of the Spirit, but if we will, we shall lose it." But as to the valid distinction between venial and mortal sin, we cannot rest it on a comparison between the two passages, for

1 Thess. v. 19. Be not quenching the Spirit,

seems connected with the line, that follows it,

1 Thess. v. 20. Be not despising prophecies.

So both would refer to distrust of the spiritual gifts, which were possessed by some of the faithful.

The line

Eph. iv. 30a. And do not be grieving the Spirit, the Holy [Spirit]
of God,

is based on Isaiah's words, which crown the account of God's love at the Exodus with that of Isreal's revolt,

Is. lxiii. 10. And they—they resisted;
And they pained [the] Spirit, His Holy [Spirit].

The word for "pained" is in the Piel or intensive form, and suggests a cutting pain. The Greek Vulgate represents it by the verb *par-ōxúnō*, "I provoke," with which our word "paroxysm" is connected through the substantive form.

The second line of the verse,

Eph. iv. 30b. In whom you were sealed unto a day of
redemption,

recalls what the Apostle has said of their being sealed with

the Holy Spirit of the promise, *Eph.* i. 13, and of that Holy Spirit as the earnest-money and part-payment

Eph. i. 14b. Unto redemption of the acquisition,

that is, until the time of the redemption, and until our acquisition, our future possession, has been fully redeemed.

Further, the picture is not complete, unless we remember that both the speaker of the foul word and the hearer have been sealed with and by and in the same Divine Spirit. Therefore, the Spirit is grieved both in him who speaks, and in him who hears.

St. Paul's fifth prohibition crowns those against lying, anger, stealing, and foul speech with one, that strikes at the root of all in forbidding uncharitableness. The passage is really composed of a prohibition and a command, in order to represent both the negative and the positive aspect of the question. First of all, then, he forbids uncharitable feelings and words, and their root in malice.

Eph. iv. 31. Every bitterness and anger and wrath
And clamour and reviling

Shall be lifted from you,
With all malice.

It is easy to see the progress from "bitterness" to the climax in "malice." And, of course, the word "every" must be interpreted as "every kind of." The passage is almost a repetition of that already written to the Colossians,

Col. iii. 8. But now put from yourselves [at once]—
You also—all the things [of the nations, such as],

Wrath, anger, malice,
Reviling, foul-talk out of your mouth.

Bitterness is excellently treated by Aristotle in the *Nicomachean Ethics* IV. v. 10, when he says, "But the

bitter," or if we will, " the sulky are difficult to reconcile," and they are angry a long time, for they withhold the anger. But a pause occurs, whenever [such a one] fully repays, for the revenge causes the wrath to cease, introducing pleasure instead of the grief. But when this does not happen, they have the burden [on their mind]. For none even persuades them, because [their trouble] is not evident; and it requires time for a man to digest the wrath within himself. And such persons are most troublesome to themselves and to their best friends." So we may define bitterness as the wilful retention of anger.

There is a difference between anger and wrath. Anger is a transient outburst, an outward manifestation and ebullition of acute feeling. Wrath is a settled and chronic condition with a purpose of revenge. This distinction was accepted by Stoics, such as Diogenes Laërtius, vii. 113, 114, a Greek writer of Laertē in Cilicia, who flourished about 150 A.D., and by the Neoplatonist, Ammonius Saccas, who taught at Alexandria under Sévérus, that is, between 193 and 211 A.D. It was probably from Ammonius Saccas, that the distinction passed to his pupil, Origen, who was head of the Christian School in Alexandria from 203 to 231, and became the greatest Master of Biblical Study in the East. His comments on *Psalms* ii. 5, and *Rom.* ii. 8, implied the distinction, which passed from him to St. Jerome, the greatest Master of Biblical Study in the West. And the latter, writing in his commentary of 388 on this very passage, explains anger, the Greek *thūmōs* and the Latin *furor*, as incipient wrath and as indignation beginning to glow in the soul. " But," he adds " it is wrath," that is, the Greek *ōrgē* and the Latin *ira*, " which desires revenge (though the anger has been extinguished), and is willing to hurt him, who it thinks has injured it."

" Clamour," the Greek *kraugē*, is primarily a raven's

croak ; but it is used of a scream or screech, and so of screaming or clamouring for some object. A little more attention is demanded by the next word, " reviling." The Greek form, *blasphēmía*, is derived from *blax*, " sluggish," and *phēmē*, the Latin *fama*, a voice, or speech, or rumour. The compound word implies profane speech. As uttered against God, we translate it " blasphemy," *Matt.* xii. 31 ; and as employed against men, we render the noun as " reviling," 1 *Tim.* vi. 4, and the verb as " revile," 1 *Cor.* iv. 13, x. 30.

We have rendered the verb in the third line as " shall be lifted." It is passive and imperative. Its first aorist or indefinite past form implies that the act should take place at once. The verb itself, *airō*, means " to lift up," so that its passive form signifies being lifted up and taken away. It is the verb, used in *John* i. 29 and 1 *John* iii. 5, of our Lord's taking up and away the sin and sins of men. And it is employed by St. Paul, when he tells how our Lord erased the manuscript or note-of-hand, consisting in ordinances, which was against us,

Col. ii. 14. And ' He has taken it up and away ' out of the midst,
When He nailed it to the Cross.

The word, which we have rendered " malice," *kākía*, is simply " badness." But in the singular it is used of vice, Plato's *Republic* 444d, and in the plural, of vices, Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* II. v. 3. Cicero held it to be the name of all the vices, that is, the name of the viciousness in them all ; and therefore he, in his *Tusculan Questions* iv. 15, invented the word *vitiositas*, " viciousness," to represent it. Trench, in his *Synonyms*, § xi., has very happily explained *kākía* as the evil habit of mind, and distinguished it from *pōnēria*, which " is the active outcoming of the same."

Now St. Paul will add the positive command ; and he will suggest the motive, which will connect the passage with the doctrine of the encyclical.

Eph. iv. 32. But be becoming kind unto one another,
Good-hearted,

[For-]giving freely to yourselves [that is, to
one another],

According as God in Christ also [for-]gave
freely to you.

It will be well now to read the parallel passage, which St. Paul had already written to the Colossians.

Col. iii. 12. Put on therefore—
(As God's elect,
Holy and loved)—
A heart of compassion,

Kindness, lowly-mindedness,
Mildness, longanimity,

13 Bearing with one another,
And [for-]giving freely to yourselves [that is, to
one another],

If anyone has a complaint against anyone—
According as the Lord [for-]gave freely to you—so
also you.

The word "kind" in *Eph.* iv. 32, and the word "kindness" in *Col.* iii. 12, imply a kindly disposition. So they mean more than the passive endurance of "longanimity," *makrō-thūmía*, and yet less than active "goodness," *agathōsūnē*. As to the word, "good-hearted," it is a compound of *eu-*, "well," and *splānchnon*, or more generally, the plural *splānchna*, the *viscera*, the "bowels," including

heart, lungs and liver. It is this word *splánchna*, which we have rendered "a heart" in *Col.* iii. 12. Since it represents the seat or organ of the feelings, it is much more accurately translated as "heart," than as "bowels." The word became specialised in Greek poetry. Æschylus, in his *Agamemnon* 1221, in 458 B.C., distinguished the *splánchna* as the heart, lungs and liver, from the *entera*, or intestines. And Euripides, in the *Rhesus* 192, if it be his, written before his death in 406 B.C., used the noun *eu-splanchnía* of a brave heart. But the medical writings, collected under the name of Hippócrates, who was born about 460, and died about 377 B.C., or later, employ the adjective of healthy bowels, not enlarged by disease. Both noun and adjective are found in the *Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs*. There we meet the phrase, "in [the] bowels of His Son." But this hardly belongs to the original book, written between 109 and 105 B.C., and is more probably a Christian interpolation. Then the adjective occurs in the *Prayer of Manasses* 7, where it is applied to God as compassionate. It is very probable that St. Peter borrowed the word from the present passage, 1 *Pet.* iii. 8, *Eph.* iv. 32. And it is noteworthy that Theophilus, who became sixth bishop of Antioch in 168 A.D., used the word *splánchna* as equivalent to *kardía*, "heart," in the book, which he wrote to *Autolycus*, a heathen, ii. 10, 22.

The verb, which we have rendered as "[for-]giving freely," is derived from *cháris*, "grace" or "favour," and usually means "to give freely." But it may mean, as in *Col.* ii. 13, iii. 13, "to give pardon" or "forgive freely." We note also that St. Paul varies the expression, "unto one another," by substituting "to yourselves." A similar change has been made in *St. Luke* xxiii. 12, and in *Col.* iii. 13. Though it is apparently to avoid monotony of phrasing, yet it also suggests the closeness of relationship

in the Messiah's Mystical Body, and shows, as Armitage Robinson says in his commentary, p. 195, that "they among themselves must do *for themselves* what God has done *for them*."

The passage is finely illustrated by the parable of the "Unmerciful Servant," *Matt.* xviii. 21-35, who refused to pardon a debt of one hundred denarii, a denarius being worth about eightpence halfpenny, though he had been pardoned a debt of ten thousand talents, a talent being worth about £240. And the motive, which is expressed in the line,

Eph. iv. 32d. According as God in Christ also [for-]gave freely
to you,

is connected with the doctrine of the epistle in regard to the Beloved,

Eph. i. 7. In whom we have the redemption
By means of His Blood,

The remission of lapses
According to the wealth of His grace.

The expression, "God in Christ," has a beautiful parallel in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, written in the summer of 56 A.D., nearly five years ago. There we read,

2 Cor. v. 19. How that God was in Christ,
Reconciling a world to Himself.

Finally, there is some conflict of testimony among the witnesses, as to whether the last word of the chapter should be "you" or "us." But it will be better to postpone the discussion of that question, till we deal with a similar one in *Eph.* v. 2.

Eph. iv. 28c. A Disputed Reading, "his own."

There are at least eleven variant readings, connected with the line,

Eph. iv. 28c. Working the good thing with his own hands.

Our best plan will be to indicate the various readings with the signs for the witnesses in support of each. So translating the Greek words in their exact order, we find—

- 1 with his own hands the good : \aleph^* A D E F G 8 pe. 37.
57. 73. 116. d e f g vg (cl and fu. demid. etc.) go boh
arm aeth Bas (regg 485) Euthal (cod) Antioch 1093
Dam (parall 565 and paris) Hier Aug (serm. dom. 2
and cont. mendac) al.
- 2 the good with his own hands : K about 15 cursives,
Thdrt
- 3 with his own hands, in order that he may have the good :
sah
- 4 he shall labour with his own hands, working the good :
ar^e syr^{sch}

These witnesses retain all the words, the variations being in arrangement.

Now turning to those witnesses, who omit some word, we meet—

- 5 with his own the good, "hands" being omitted :
- 6 the good with his hands, "his" being substituted for
"his own" : 46
- 7 the good with the hands, "his own" being omitted :
L many cursives Chr¹²¹ Oec Dam Thphyl
- 8 with the hands the good, "his own" being again omitted :
 \aleph^o B am Ambrst

- 9 the good, "with his own hands" being omitted: P 17.
67** m (82) Clem (pp. 308 and 371) Or (cat 184) Cod.
Laur. 184
- 10 with hands, "his own" and "the good" being omitted:
Tert (res carn 45)
- 11 working with his own hands, in order that you may be
able to distribute to those who have not, "the
good" being omitted: Epiph 92.

It is clear that 11 has little weight, being merely a free citation by St. Epiphanius, who became bishop in Cyprus in 368. Whatever value it has, is that of a witness to the Greek word, rendered throughout as "his own."

In 10, Tertullian, who indeed used Greek manuscripts and became a Montanist in 199, is quoting freely in his treatise on the *Resurrection of the Flesh*, written about 210 A.D., and not as a witness to the text.

In 5, the only witness is the cursive 47, of the eleventh century.

In 6, the only witness is the cursive 46, of the same century.

In 3, the Sahidic version of southern Egypt merely places "the good" too late.

In 4, the phrase "with his own hands" is merely placed too early in two printed versions, that is, in the Erpenian Arabic, made in 1616 from a Greek manuscript of 1342 A.D., and in the Schaafian edition of the Syriac New Testament, published in 1708 A.D. Indeed, those versions really testify to the translator's views of the construction, not to the state of the text.

So far, we have excluded 3, 4, 5, 6, 10 and 11. In 7 and 9, we have interesting examples of a Syrian and a later Alexandrian reading. We may take 7 first. This reading "the good with the hands," is first found in St. Chrysostom,

p. 121, that is, before 398. Then it occurs in Œcumenius, a Thessalian bishop about 600, and next in St. John Damascene, between 717 and 741, both of whom obtained it from St. Chrysostom. Then it appears in the Greek uncial, the Angelic L, of the ninth century; and it will be remembered that when we, in § 7 of our preface, examined the various readings of *Eph.* ii. 8, iii. 21, v. 19, v. 21, and vi. 18, we found that L followed the Syrian or Official Text in four out of the five cases. Afterwards Theophylact, the Constantinopolitan Archbishop of the Bulgarians about 1077, who borrowed much from St. Chrysostom, will present the same form. This will appear also in many cursives, such manuscripts being Syrian as a rule. Clearly, therefore, 7 is merely a Syrian reading without other support.

Now, 9 reads "the good," omitting "with his own hands." The very form of the variant suggests an Alexandrian source, the Alexandrian scribes being as ready to make the text smooth and free from apparent redundancies, as the Western scribes to interpolate. When we regard the witnesses in the present case, we cannot say that the Porphyrian P, of the ninth century, is uniformly Alexandrian. In the five typical instances, *Eph.* ii. 8, iii. 21, v. 19, v. 21 and vi. 18, noted in § 7 of our preface, we found it Alexandrian in the first and fourth, Syrian in the second and fifth, and Western in the third. But in the present place it is associated with Alexandrian Texts, for 17, a cursive of Cent. ix. or x., is Alexandrian in the first, second, fourth and fifth of those readings, and the second hand, that of the corrector, in 67, a cursive made between 1064 and 1068, is of the same character. Further, according to Potter's 1715 edition of the Alexandrian Clement, pp. 308 and 371, the sentence is quoted in this form by the great Athenian, who became president of the Alexandrian School about 189. The same reading is followed by Origen, who

succeeded him in 203, if the latter's quotation of the sentence is rightly reported in Cramer's *Caténæ*, and rightly understood by us. It is interesting, but of small consequence to find the variant in the *Speculum*, or "Mirror," m, attributed to St. Augustine, but really belonging to the eighth or ninth century, according to Gregory, in his edition of *Tischendorf* iii. p. 961, and his *Canon and Text of the New Testament* p. 410. Mayor in the *Epistle of St. James* p. 3, quotes the Palaeographical Society, Ser. II. p. 34, as dating the oldest manuscript, the Floriacensis, at the end of Cent. vii. And on p. cclxxxiv., he refers to Sanday's opinion that this Spanish text of the Old Latin 'was put together somewhere in the circle in which Priscillian [died 385 A.D.] moved, and from a copy of the Bible, which, if not exactly his, was yet closely related to it.' It is interesting to find the Alexandrian variant in a Spanish Text, but one course of art and literature appears to have moved from Egypt along the North of Africa to Spain and Ireland. The variant, we may note, is also found in the Laurentian cursive 184, of Florence, and the year 984.

We may also exclude 2, as the evidence is entirely Syrian, consisting of K, about 15 cursives and Theodoret. In the five typical cases, the Moscovian K, of the ninth century, showed the Syrian reading in the first three and the last, its variant in the fourth being peculiar. The cursives, which began only in the ninth century, are generally Syrian. And the one ecclesiastical writer in support of the reading, if he be truly represented in the printed editions of his commentary on St. Paul's epistles, was Theodoret, consecrated for Syrian Cyrus in 423, and of St. Chrysostom's school.

Only 1 and 8 are left. These differ with regard to the one word *idiaîs*, "his own." Some have described this as an interpolation from

1 Cor. iv. 12. And we labour, **working** with our **own** hands,

“own” representing the same Greek word, *idiai*s. Others have argued that it was thought superfluous in *Eph.* iv. 28, and omitted. But no scribe held it superfluous in *1 Cor.* iv. 12, and omitted it there. The question, however, is completely determined by the extrinsic evidence, which establishes the word as an integral part of the text.

The word is certainly omitted by the Vatican B, probably of Caesarea and the year 331. It is not found in Ambrosiaster, writing at Rome under Pope Dámasus, 366-384 A.D. It is rejected by a seventh century scribe, the second corrector of the Sinaitic Aleph. And it is not found in the Latin Vulgate, according to the Codex Amiatinus, made a little before 716. Indeed, were it not for the great influence of the Vatican B, none would have defended the omission for a moment.

On the other hand, *1* and the word are supported by witnesses of all periods and classes.

First of all, the Neutral Text supports it through the Sinaitic Aleph, of the same year 331 and the same library as the Vatican B.

In the second place, it is upheld by the Alexandrian Text. When we spoke of the quotation from Origen in Cramer's *Caténæ*, we were not enthusiastic about its correctness, because we find the word both in the shorter *Rules* ii. 485 (of the Benedictine edition) of St. Basil, consecrated in 370, and in the commentary of St. Jerome in 388, both writers being influenced by Origen. And further, we find it in the Bohairic version, made for northern Egypt about 200 or 250. Early in the fifth century, it appears in the Alexandrian uncial A, and a little later, in 458, in the Alexandrian deacon, Euthalius, according to the codex or manuscript of 1301.

The Syrian Text is well represented among the witnesses in favour of the word. There is Antiochus, a monk in the

monastery of St. Sabbas, near Jerusalem, about the year 614. That monastery is also associated with St. John the Damascene, who flourished between 717 and 741. He supports this reading according to his collection of *Parallels* and the Codex Parisinus, though his commentary sustains the variant 7. Of cursives, there is the St. Petersburg 8, the eleventh century 73, the thirteenth century 57 and 116, and the fifteenth century 37. And as we have noted, the text of cursives is generally Syrian in character.

We should add the Armenian version, made after 431, and retaining some Old Syriac readings, and the Ethiopic version, badly made about 600, and revised in the fourteenth century or later. Both the Syriac Peshitta of 411 A.D., and the Harclean Syriac of 616 A.D., also insert the possessive pronoun.

Finally, the Western Text sufficiently maintains the word. It is present in the Latin Vulgate of 385, that edition of the Pauline epistles being only a modified form of the Old Latin. It was not indeed in the Codex Amiatinus of that Vulgate, but it is in the Fuldensis of 540, the Demidovianus of Cent. xii. or xiii., other manuscripts, and the Clementine edition of 1592. St. Augustine in 393 A.D., in his *Sermon on the Mount* II. xvii., vol. iii., col. 1295, in the Benedictine edition, and in his tract *on Lying*, vol. vi., of 395 A.D., supports the reading. Then it is contained in the Gothic version, which was indeed made after 341, but became affected by Old Latin readings after the Lombards' invasion of Italy in 568. The Old Latin manuscripts themselves contain the words. It is found both in the Old Latin and in the Greek columns of the Claromontanus D, Cent. vi., of its copy, the Sangerman E, Cent. ix., and in the twin uncials, the Augien F and the Boernerian G, Cent. ix.

CHAPTER V

PERSONAL HOLINESS

This chapter contains a series of directions, which may be divided into two classes. The first would include five definite commands regarding Christian love, *Eph.* v. 1-5, Christian light, v. 6-14, Christian wisdom, v. 15-17, Christian gladness, v. 18-20, and Christian submission, v. 21. These have been described as a tablet or table of five commandments, embodying our duty towards God. But an examination of them will show that they are mainly self-regarding, as the five prohibitions in *Eph.* iv. 25-32, were other-regarding. This second table is connected with the first by the word "therefore," the imitation of God, which it enjoins, being based on the forgiveness of us by God in Christ. It is also connected with the passage, which follows, the Christian submission in *Eph.* v. 21, introducing that of wives to their husbands.

The chapters could indeed have been better divided by Stephen Langton, the cardinal archbishop of Canterbury, when he set his hand to the work in 1204 or 1205. In making the division at the end of iv. 32, he does not follow that which Euthalius in 458 A.D., copied from a work, apparently made by Theodore of Mopsuestia in 396 A.D. And unfortunately Langton's division obscures the relation between the directions at the close of the one chapter

and those at the commencement of the other. From *Eph.* iv. 25, there are precepts and prohibitions as to the new man and the old man, of whom the Apostle has just spoken, *Eph.* iv. 24, 22. First, there is the fivefold series of other-regarding duties, *Eph.* iv. 25-32. Then there is a fivefold series of duties, mainly self-regarding, and apparently in view of pagan pleasures and festivities, v. 1-21. And there follows a series of regulations for home life, *Eph.* v. 22-vi. 9, dealing with the father, the mother, the child and the slave. St. Paul then looks out upon the wider scene of Christian activity, and gives direction for the battle with preternatural powers, *Eph.* vi. 10-18.

Eph. v. 1-5. Christian Love.

We must recall Trench's beautiful saying that *āgāpē*, "love," is "a word, born within the bosom of revealed religion." It is not found in any pagan writer, but occurs in the Greek Vulgate of 2 *Sam.* xiii. 15, *Cant.* ii. 4, *Jer.* ii. 2, and *Wisd.* iii. 9, and in Philo, *On the Immutability of God* xiv., this Alexandrian having learned the word from the Greek Vulgate. On the other hand, neither the pagan word *ērōs*, "love," nor any of its cognate forms is ever found in the Greek Testament. The noun *āgāpē* is not found in *Mark*, only once in *Matthew* xxiv. 12, and only once in *Luke* xi. 42. The corresponding verb *āgāpān*, "to love," has been distinguished from *phileîn*, "to love," for example in *John* xxi. 15-17, as the Latin *diligo*, "I love by an act of intelligent choice," from *amo*, "I love with a personal affection." St. Augustine, indeed, in his *City of God* xiv. 7, discusses with little positive result the difference between *dilectio*, "love" or "charity," and *amor*, "love." But the chief note of the former, in so far as it represents the Greek *āgāpē*, would appear to be esteem, appreciation, respect and often even reverence. Yet in the present

passage of the encyclical, St. Paul will be obliged to clarify the *āgāpē*, the love, of which he speaks, from the uncontrolled impulse and passion, so often, in ancient and modern times, described as love.

The Apostle has just written,

Eph. iv. 32a. But be becoming kind unto one another.

Now he resumes the verb, saying

Eph. v. 1. Be becoming, therefore, imitators of God,
As loved children.

Nearly six years ago, in the autumn of 55 A.D., he had twice bidden the Corinthian Christians,

1 Cor. iv. 16, xi. 1. Be becoming imitators of me.

But now it is primarily the example of God's readiness to give full forgiveness, that is in question. Indeed, more than this is also implied as the next couplet will show. It is more, too, than the command to be holy because of Jehovah's holiness, *Lev. xi. 44, xix. 2*, quoted in *1 Pet. i. 16*. It is based on the intimate relation between a child and its father, the word for children, *těkna*, implying sonship by birth and not by adoption or position. Such a rule of conduct would be fulfilled in acting according to that likeness of God, in which man was originally made, *Gen. i. 26*. This is the easier, because the ideal has already been embodied in the Messiah or Christ, who is both the image and the likeness of the Invisible God.

It was therefore fitting that the Christ Himself should say,

Matt. v. 48. You shall, therefore, be perfect,
As your Father, the heavenly [Father] is perfect.

And so He says again,

Luke vi. 36. Be becoming compassionate,
According as your Father is compassionate.

It is also fitting that the Apostle, who understood the Master's mind so well, and never hesitated to employ bold speech, should bid us,

Eph. v. 1. Be becoming, therefore, imitators of God.

The word was taken up by St. Ignatius of Antioch, in 115 A.D., when he was on his way to martyrdom. Writing to the Ephesian Christians from Smyrna, he described them as "imitators of God," i. 1. And again, he used the expression with regard to their Trallian neighbours, when he wrote to the church at Tralles, i. 2.

We may note also that the word "love" is the key-word of our present passage, for the "loved" children must walk "in love," as the Christ "loved" them. Indeed, the command covers more than the sphere of forgiveness, since there is added,

Eph. v. 2. And be walking in love,
According as the Christ also loved you ;

And [as] He delivered up Himself
On behalf of us,

An offering and sacrifice to God
Unto odour of fragrance.

The "walking in love" would cover the whole field of conduct, and not that alone in respect of injuries. The word "also" is ambiguous. It may mean "the Christ also, as well as the Father," or "the Christ also loved you, as you ought to love your neighbour." The "also,"

however, does not introduce a third person, but the second parallel in the comparison, in

John xiii. 34. I am giving you a fresh commandment,
In order that you may love one another,

According as I loved you,
In order that you also may love one another.

Therefore, we do not explain the "also" in the present passage, *Eph.* v. 2, as referring to the Father. And our conclusion is confirmed by the parallel passage in the epistle, which St. Paul has just written to the Colossians,

Col. iii. 13c. If anyone has a complaint against anyone—
According as the Lord [for-]gave freely to you, so
also you.

The connection between our Lord's love and His delivering up Himself was expressed nearly twelve years ago, in 49 A.D., by the Apostle in his epistle to the churches of southern Galatia, when he spoke of the life, which he now lived in flesh, as one, that

Gal. ii. 20. I am living in faith,
The [faith] in the Son of God,

Who loved me,
And delivered up Himself on behalf of me.

And in the present epistle, he will again present it as a motive for married Christians, saying,

Eph. v. 25. Husbands, love your wives,
According as also the Christ loved the Church,

And delivered Himself up on behalf of her,
In order that He might sanctify her.

Then, in describing that Divine sacrifice, St. Paul falls

naturally into the language of the Old Testament, presenting our Lord as

Eph. v. 2. An offering and sacrifice to God.

In the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, the order of the words is

Heb. x. 5. A sacrifice and offering,

because they are quoted accurately from *Psalms* xl. 6. That reference, however, will help us to see what Hebrew words underlie St. Paul's Greek. The offering, the Greek *prōsphōrā*, is the Hebrew *minchāh*, or meal-offering, a bloodless sacrifice. And the sacrifice, the Greek *thūsia*, is the Hebrew *zēbhach*, literally "a slaying," and so the act or victim of sacrifice. By the phrase, then, St. Paul implies the completeness of our Lord's sacrifice, as realising what was represented in both forms of the typical rite.

The Apostle adds another phrase, "an odour of fragrance," to express God's acceptance of the sacrifice. Within a few months, he will employ the same language in a letter to the Philippian Christians.

Phil. iv. 18. But I have all things in full,
And I overflow.

I have been filled—
When I received from Epaphroditus

The [things] from you,
An odour of fragrance,

An acceptable sacrifice,
Well-pleasing to God.

The phrase, "an odour of fragrance," is very common in the Greek Vulgate, being found about forty times in the *Pentateuch*, for example in *Gen.* viii. 21, *Exod.* xxix. 18, and *Lev.* i. 9, 13, 17, besides four times in *Ezekiel*. Its

occurrence in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, "Levi," 3, written originally between 109 and 105 B.C., may be an interpolation. In any case, the phrase, wherever it occurs, is to be explained by the Hebrew *rêach-nîchôach*, "an odour of rest," or "acquiescence," that is, of satisfaction, or even of delight. The origin of the metaphor, no doubt, may be found in the language and ideas, connected with pagan sacrifices. In this connection, it is relevant to refer to a comparatively late work, such as Homer's *Iliad* i. 317, viii. 549, xxiv. 69, 70, written between 950 and 900 B.C., that is, about the time of Solomon, 960 to 931 B.C. But when such figures of speech are adopted into revealed religion, they can no longer be interpreted in a crude, material fashion. And this phrase, "an odour of fragrance," in the epistles of St. Paul, has not only been raised from a pagan expression to a Jewish figure, but also from a Jewish figure to a Christian symbol.

Having spoken of Christian love positively, the Apostle proceeds to deal with it negatively by forbidding sinful love, whether sensual or avaricious. In this, he sums up the commandment against adultery and that against coveting a neighbour's property, *Ex.* xx. 14, 17, *Deut.* v. 18, 21. There is therefore a reference now to gain, though we found none in

Eph. iv. 19. Unto a working of all uncleanness in greediness.

So, we now find the notion of "fornication" completed by "uncleanness"; and "greediness" stands by itself.

Eph. v. 3. But fornication and every uncleanness,
Or greediness,—

It shall not even be named among you,
According as becomes holy [ones].

4. And let [there not be] shamefulfulness and foolish-talk,
 Or 'versatility,'
 Which were not fitting—
 But rather [let there be] thanksgiving.

In *Gal.* v. 19, the Apostle has already connected fornication and uncleanness. In *2 Cor.* xii. 21, he conjoins uncleanness, fornication and licence. Now he adds greediness, or covetousness, because the desire of having more goods shares with the desire of sensual pleasure the bad eminence of false love. When we presently add to these false light, and its effect in false enlightenment, *Eph.* v. 6-14, then we shall have the sensuality, the avarice and the intellectual pride, that is, the flesh's desire, the eyes' desire, and life's pretension, 1 *John* ii. 16, which are the three principal means of men's fall.

When it is said that none of such things may be named among those who are holy saints and separated unto God, there is indeed an external resemblance to the Persian rule, as given by *Herodotus* i. 138, about 444 B.C., that it is not lawful even to speak of those things, which it is not lawful to do. But St. Paul adds a motive, loftier and more effective than any known to those Persians, who, according to the same authority, i. 135, indulged in those very uncleannesses, forbidden by revelation and nature.

St. Paul's word "named" has hardly been suggested by

Ps. xvi. 4. I will not take up their names upon my lips,

the "names" being those of the apostates, who had abandoned Jehovah for heathen gods. It was indeed forbidden to name the idols, for the "Book of the Covenant," *Exodus* xx.-xxiii., contains the prohibition,

Ex. xxiii. 13. And you shall not mention the name of other gods ;
It shall not be heard upon thy mouth.

But when the Apostle urges those, who are in the position of God's holy ones, to observe a similar silence regarding certain sins, he does not require it as a matter of moral obligation, *Heb.* ii. 17, or of logical necessity, *Heb.* ii. 1, but of fitness, *Heb.* ii. 10.

Then St. Paul adds the names of three other offences against Christian love,

Eph. v. 4. And [let there not be] shamefulfulness and foolish talk,
Or versatility.

It is hardly necessary to supply the words, "let there not be," as the sense of the passage is quite plain without them.

The word "shamefulness" renders the Greek *aischrôtēs*, never found elsewhere in the Greek Text of the New Testament, or in the Greek Vulgate of the Old. It is formed from *aischrōs*, "causing shame" or "shameful," and is used in Plato's *Gorgias* 525 A, c. 170, to describe the soul of an Asiatic, who had lived basely. Dying, it appeared before Rhadamanthus, who saw it to be full of disproportion and shamefulfulness through power, luxury, wantonness and intemperance. So the shamefulfulness is the ugliness, resulting from vice, not a vice itself. But in the present Pauline passage, it is equally clear that the word is used in the sense of shameful conduct.

From conduct, the Apostle passes on to speech. The word for "foolish-talk," *mōrō-lōgia*, like that for "shamefulness," is not found elsewhere in Biblical Greek. About 340 B.C., it was used by Aristotle, in his *History of Animals* i. 11, and by Plutarch, who died about 120 A.D., in his *Morals* 504 B. Plautus, who died in 184 B.C., Latinised the adjective as *morologus* in his *Persa* I. i. 50, and rendered it as *stultiloquium* in his *Miles Gloriosus* II. iii. 25.

From shameful conduct and foolish speech, the Apostle passes into the mind itself, and forbids *eutrápēlia*. As there has been much discussion about this word, we have rendered it simply as "versatility." This is in accordance with its etymology, for it is compounded from *eu-*, "well," and *trēpō*, "I turn," to imply turning easily, "versatility," as in the *Ethics* IV. viii. 3, of Aristotle, who died in 322 B.C. Earlier, indeed, Pindar, who died about 442 B.C., had in his fourth *Pythian Ode* 104, presented his hero Jason as able to declare that he had never in twenty years spoken one *eutrápēlon* word to his comrades. But Pericles, a little later, at the end of 431, and according to *Thucydides* ii. 41, applied the adverb in a complimentary sense to the Athenians. Plato, in his *Republic* 563 A, VIII. xiv., begun before 389 B.C., does not employ the noun so favourably. Speaking of democratic liberty as passing into democratic licence, he pictures the old men as condescending to the young men, and as satisfied with *eutrapelia* and pleasant jesting in imitation of the young men. Evidently, he applies the word to a form of banter and repartee, still popular among those, unable to put away childish things.

Aristotle, in his *Rhetoric* ii. 12, which is not later than 338 B.C., says that the young are *eutrápēloi*, because they are fond of mirth. He defines *eutrápēlia* as chastened insolence, or, as a schoolboy might render the phrase, "well-trained cheek." Theodore of Mopsuestia, in his commentary written between 415 and 429 A.D., if we may judge from the Latin version, in which his comment exists, explained the word as "scurrility," which he defined as "detraction," apparently, as Swete suggests in his edition, i. 177, understanding the Greek word as "ill-natured wit." In Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, the noun is found in II. vii. 13, and the adjective in II. vii. 13, IV. viii. 3, 4, 10, VIII. iii. 1, iv. 1, vi. 5, X. vi. 3. There *eutrápēlia* is distinguished from

the one extreme, *bōmō-lōchia*, literally "altar-lurking," that is, for scraps, and applied to a low parasite, a buffoon. The notion is fully expressed in Kipling's *The Mary Gloster*, 85, 86,

"Weak, a liar, and idle, and mean as a collier's whelp
Nosing for scraps in the galley."

Again Aristotle distinguishes it from the other extreme, *agrōikía*, "rusticity," boorishness, supposed to be characteristic of an *agr-oikos*, one dwelling in the *agrōs*, or country. He confesses, however, that those who love, not for moral good, nor for utility, but for pleasure, love the *eutrápēloi*, because such persons are pleasant to them, VIII. iii. 1; and he describes those who are *eutrápēloi* in idle pastimes as in favour with despots, X. vi. 3. But Aristotle makes another statement, which explains St. Paul's condemnation of *eutrápēlia*. In IV. viii. 6, he looks for a parallel to the relation between the boyish play of the *eutrápēlos*, free and educated, and similar behaviour on the part of a slave and an uneducated man. He finds it in the relation between the New Comedy, which was laughable through covert suggestion, and the Old Comedy, which was laughable through shameful speech. So the "jesting" of the Revised Version fails to indicate the matter of *eutrápēlia*; and "scurrility" ignores the subtlety of the double meaning. In lack of an equivalent English word,* we follow the etymology and most general sense of the term in rendering it "versatility."

There is an illustration of the *eutrápēlos* in P. Volumnius, a friend of Cicero and Mark Anthony. This man, mentioned in Cicero's *Familiar Letters* xxxii., was known as Eutrápelus, because of his wit. Of this, we have an example in Horace's *Epistles* I. xviii. 31-36, where we read that

. . Eutrapelus, when he was desirous of injuring anyone,
 Used to give him costly robes ; for now, said he, happy
 With beautiful garments, he will take up new plans and hopes
 He will sleep till sunrise. He will prefer a prostitute to
 honourable
 Duty. He will live by borrowing. At the end,
 He will be a gladiator, or lead a kitchen-gardener's nag
 for hire.

If we may gather from this instance, that the *eutrápēlos* may still be found in taverns and smoking-rooms, we may also see the incompatibility of his character with Pauline heroism.

The Apostle says of such things that they are not befitting. He employs the word *an-ēkēn*, the imperfect tense of *an-ēkō*. In classical writers, as Lightfoot argues in his commentary on *Col.* iii. 18, that imperfect would have implied that what ought to have been done had been left undone. But St. Paul's use of the form is more like our use of the past tense, "ought," and "perhaps implies an essential *a priori* obligation."

Instead of *eu-trāpēlia*, "versatile jesting," St. Paul urges *eu-chāristia*, "thanksgiving." The similarity of the forms suggests a contrast between the meanings. The Apostle has just written to the Colossians, saying,

Col. iii. 15. And the peace of the Christ,
 Let it umpire in your hearts—

Unto which [peace] you were also called in one body,
 And be becoming thankful [*eucharistoi*].

And now he adds a conclusion to this section of his encyclical,

Eph. v. 5. For you know about this, knowing
 That no fornicator, or unclean [man],

Or greedy [man]—

Which [word implies one who] is an idolater—

Has possession in the kingdom

Of the Christ and God.

In the first line, we have two Greek verbs for knowing. The first is *oída*, that is, *scire*, *wissen*, *savoir*, "to know about." The second is *ginōscō*, that is, *noscere*, *kennen*, *connaître*, "to know." The two are combined to produce the strength and intensity, obtained in Hebrew by placing the verb in its absolute infinitive before the finite form. This Hebrew construction may be represented in Biblical Greek by such phrasing as "with desire I desired," implying "I greatly desired," *Luke* xxii. 15, or by similar forms of expression, *Gen.* xxxi. 30, *Ex.* xxi. 20, *Deut.* vii. 26, *Matt.* xiii. 14, xv. 4, *John* iii. 29, *Acts* v. 28, xxiii. 14, *James* v. 17. The particular Hebrew phrase, "to know you will know," for "you will surely know," is found fourteen times in the Old Testament. It is generally rendered in the Greek Vulgate as "knowing, you will know"; and this representation of the Hebrew infinitive absolute by the Greek participle is found in *Heb.* vi. 14. In *Jeremiah* xlii. 22, however, the Hebrew phrase is translated "you know about, knowing," in several Greek manuscripts. But in them, the Greek words are marked with an asterisk, showing that they had been interpolated in the Greek Vulgate by Origen, when he at Caesarea prepared the nearly fifty volumes of his Hexaplar, or "Sixfold," edition, which included the Hebrew Text, the Hebrew Text in Greek letters, with the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, the Septuagint or Greek Vulgate, and Theodotion. Generally, his additions are taken from Theodotion's version, made about 180 A.D., but sometimes from Aquila's, made about 125 A.D., or from that of Symmachus, about 200 A.D. We may, however,

argue that the form, interpolated in *Jer.* xlii. 22, was suggested by S. Paul's expression in our present passage, *Eph.* v. 5 ; and it is consequently useful as showing that his phrase was regarded as equivalent to the Hebrew for "you certainly know."

There is another Hebrew idiom in the Greek Text ; but it is hidden in our translation, because we must render "every fornicator has not possession" as "no fornicator has possession."

As the relative pronoun in the fourth line is in the neuter form, according to the reading, which we adopt and will justify, it cannot refer to "greedy [man]," but to the word for such, or his character. In the *Epistle to the Colossians*, St. Paul has just said,

Col. iii. 5. Deaden, therefore, the members,
The [members] on the earth—

[Put from yourselves] fornication, uncleanness,
Passion, bad desires,

And [especially] the greediness,
Which [greediness is such that it] is idolatry.

Now he writes, as we see,

Eph. v. 5. For you certainly know
That no fornicator, or unclean [man],

Or greedy [man],
Which [word implies one who] is an idolater—

Has possession in the kingdom
Of the Christ and God.

And as the Apostle, within a few months, will write of those who make a god of the belly, *Phil.* iii. 19, there is nothing strange in his speaking now of those who make a

god of their neighbour's possessions to the loss of their own possession in the kingdom. This kingdom is the Christ's, for He is the King. It is God's, for it has its goal in Him, *1 Cor.* xv. 24, and it had its origin in the Father's design for His Incarnate Son. But the Messiah, or Christ, and the Father are one, *John* x. 30. Hence both can be placed together under the one article, as "the Christ and God." The phrase is, indeed, unique; and it is very significant, for we cannot imagine a case in which the Creator and a mere creature could be ranged together under one article.

Eph. v. 2. Disputed Readings, "you," "which."

We decided to treat the question of the pronoun in *Eph.* iv. 32d, in connection with the similar questions in v. 2. It is noteworthy that *humeís*, "you," in the nominative, and *hēmeís*, "we," are pronounced alike in Modern Greek, as are also *humās*, "you," in the accusative, and *hēmās*, "us." The variants in the manuscripts suggest that the copyists were very liable to write one for the other. So we have a question between "you" and "us" in iv. 32d, v. 2b, v. 2d.

We have another question in *Eph.* v. 5d. There are three variants, "which is idolater," "who is idolater," and "which is idolatry." Now we can explain the second and third variants, if the first was the original. The relative clause, "which is idolater," needs interpretation as "which [word or character implies one who] is idolater." It could be simplified in two ways. An *s* could be added to the *ho*, changing "which" into "who," agreeing with the antecedent, "greedy [man]." Or less effectively, the word for "idolater" could be changed into "idolatry," which is found in the parallel passage, *Col.* iii. 5. The latter solution was adopted by some Old Latin manuscripts. It is

preserved for us by St. Cyprian, consecrated for Carthage about 248, by Victorinus and Ambrosiaster at Rome, about 360, by St. Ambrose of Milan in his treatise *on the Faith*, in 379, vol. ii. p. 3, of the Benedictine edition, by St. Jerome in his Latin Vulgate of the Pauline epistles, a modified form of the Old Latin, in 385, by the Gothic version, which became affected by the Old Latin Text after 568, and by the twin uncials, the Augien F and the Boernerian G, both of Italy and the ninth century. The reading "idolatry," therefore, does not call for serious attention. In *Eph.* v. 5d, we are only concerned with the question between "which" and "who," or, as they would appear in the uncials, between O and OC.

We have, therefore, four questions; and it will be interesting to note how the various witnesses testify in their regard. We have read "you" in iv. 32d, "you" in v. 2b, "us" in v. 2d, and "which" in v. 5d. The alternative readings are respectively "us," "us," "you" and "who." None of these affects a doctrine; but each is important, as every clue is important, for determining the character and value of particular manuscripts.

We may say that the Old Latin readings are "you," "us," "us," "which." So we learn from the Claromontanus d, of Cent. vi. and its ninth century copy, the Sangerman e, from the Augien f and its twin the Boernerian g, both of Cent. ix., as well as from St. Cyprian's testimony to "which," and that of his master, Tertullian, about 210, in his *Resurrection of the Flesh* 45, to "you," in the first place. We can therefore overlook the singular action of the *Speculum*, or "Mirror," of Cent. ix. or x., in reading "you" in the second and third places. And our conclusion is confirmed by the Latin Vulgate of 385, although "us" was substituted in the first place by the Fuldensis about 540, and by the Amiatinus just before 716. Not only so, but the Gothic

version, Ambrosiaster of Rome under Pope Dámasus, 366-384, the Augien uncial F, and the Boernerian uncial G, indicate the series "you," "us," "us," "which," as the Old Latin. It would indeed appear that the manuscript, from which the Augien F and the Boernerian G were copied, was made in Italy by a Latin, who adapted the Greek Text to the Latin version, and may even have derived much of the Greek from the Latin, as Erasmus in 1516 sent forth the first printed Greek Testament with several words and the last six verses of the *Apocalypse*, translated by himself from the Latin Vulgate into Greek.

The Syrian readings are "us," "us," "us," "who." These we find in the Syriac Peshitta or Vulgate of 411, the Syrian Theodoret, consecrated about 423, the Armenian version, made after 431, the Harclean Syriac of 616, the ninth-century uncials, the Moscovian K and the Angelic L, and the eleventh century cursive, 47. St. Basil, about 370, and St. Chrysostom, before 398, read "us" in the second and third places. This series is indeed found in the Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi. and its copy, the Sangerman E, of cent. ix., but may fairly enough be described as Syrian.

The Alexandrian readings are "you," "you," "us," "who." So read St. Clement, the Athenian convert, who became head of the Alexandrian school about 189. Origen supports him by reading "you" in the first place and "us" in the third. It is true that Cramer's *Caténæ* vi. p. 188, of 1842, represents Origen as using "us" in the first place, but Origen's Latin interpreter, iv. 671, at the end of the fourth century, read "you." The evidence of St. Clement is supported by the Alexandrian manuscript A of the fifth century and by the Porphyrian P of the ninth.

Further, we find

in the Sinaitic Aleph,	you,	you,	us,	which,
in the Vatican B,	us,	you,	you,	which,
in the Bohairic version,	you,	us,	us,	who,

We have already found

the Western Reading to be,	you,	us,	us,	which,
the Syrian Reading,	us,	us,	us,	who,
the Alexandrian Reading,	you,	you,	us,	who.

In the first case, we accept "you," as supported by the Alexandrian Text, the Western Text, the Sinaitic uncial, and the Bohairic version. It is a matter of little consequence, that it is confirmed by Euthalius of Alexandria in 458. The chief point is the weakness of a Syrian reading in opposition to the other types.

In the second case, we again accept "you," as supported by the Alexandrian Text, and by the Neutral Text of the Sinaitic Aleph and Vatican B.

In the third case, we read "us" with the Alexandrian, Western, and Syrian Texts, supported by the Sinaitic uncial and the Bohairic version.

In the fourth case, we noted a scribe's motive for changing "which" into "who." And as there is no reason for changing "who" into "which," we regard the internal evidence as favourable to the latter. We are quite prepared to find "who" in the polished Alexandrian Text. But viewing the internal and external evidence as a whole, we seem bound to read "which."

Eph. v. 6-14. Christian Light.

The second of the self-regarding directions has regard to Christian Light, as the first had reference to Christian Love.

Only four years ago, on Saturday, April 30, 57, the Apostle warned the Ephesian presbyters against false teachers,

Acts xx. 30. After his release, early next year, 62, and his visit to Spain, he will leave St. Timothy in Ephesus as a defence against misleaders, 1 *Tim.* i. 3. Yet, in the summer of 66, he will write from his Roman prison, and tell how all they of Roman Asia have forsaken him. Then, too, he will point to Hymenaeus and Philetus as preachers of heresy, 2 *Tim.* i. 15, ii. 17. At a later date, 95 A.D., the Apocalyptic Epistles to the Seven Churches will show the great inroads of false doctrine.

Now, he has just written to the Colossians,

Col. ii. 8. Look you, lest there shall be anyone who leads you
off as spoil
By means of the philosophy and empty deceit,

that is, as the position of the two nouns under one preposition and article shows,

By means of his philosophy, which is empty deceit.

And here in the encyclical, the Apostle will describe the same thing by the very phrase which Plato employed in his *Laches* 169 B, sometime between 385 and 348 B.C. But that expression, "with empty words," meaning "with false words," as in Galen's *de diff. puls.* iii. 6, about 170 A.D., is not such as to indicate any connection between the epistles of St. Paul and the dialogues of Plato. Further, Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* II. vii. 1, ought not to be quoted in this connection, because the true reading there, according to the best manuscripts, Bekker's K and L, is "more general." The same question of variants is found in the *Ethics* III. viii. 6. But we may quote the *Eudemian Ethics* I. vi. 4, where the expression, "empty words," is used in a bad sense. However the Apostle's words are sufficiently simple.

- Eph. v. 6. None shall deceive you with empty words—
 For on account of these [sins], the wrath
 of God is coming
 On the sons of disobedience—
 7. Be not therefore becoming co-partakers with
 them,

that is, in their disobedience, and consequently in the wrath or judgement of God. It is plain that we must understand sins as those things, on account of which the judgement of God is coming now and at the Final Judgement. If there were any doubt about the matter, it would be settled by the parallel passage in *Colossians* iii. 5, 6, where the mention of those sins is followed by the statement,

Col. iii. 6. On account of which things, the wrath of God is coming.

St. Paul has already mentioned "the sons of disobedience," the disobedient men in revolt against God's revelation and their own conscience, *Eph.* ii. 2. The recurrence of their name recalls his theme of the Gentile's position as members of the Church. And again, as in *Eph.* ii. 11-22, and iv. 17-24, he contrasts the new condition of his readers with their old. The three verses, in which he does so, form a parenthesis, into which he inserts another parenthesis as a parenthesis within the parenthesis, or a vinculum within the bracket, to tell what are the effects, by which supernatural light may be known. So he dictates,

- Eph. v. 8. (For you were sometime darkness,
 But now [you are] light in [the] Lord.

Be walking as children of light—

9. For the fruit of the light is in every [form
of] goodness
And justice and truth—
10. Proving what is well-pleasing to the Lord.)

As so many writers, including Darby, in his *Synopsis* iv. 430, Moule and Westcott, in their commentaries, have pointed out, the Apostle does not say that his readers had been in darkness, but that they had been darkness, their social effect being that of moral darkness. But now, "in [the] Lord," in union and communion with Him, they are light. He indeed is the Light of the world, *John* viii. 12. Because they are in Him, they also "are the light of the world," *Matt.* v. 14. And as St. Paul has just told the Colossians, i. 12, they were made sufficient to receive their part of the saints' lot "in the light," that is, "in the kingdom of supernatural light."

Now, for the sixth time, the Apostle uses the word "walk" as the Hebrew *hālākh*, "to walk," in reference to conduct. And he urges his readers to be walking as children of light. The source of that phrase, "children of light," seems to be in the "Parable of the Unjust Steward," where "the sons of the light" are contrasted with "the sons of this age," *Luke* xvi. 8. St. Paul, in writing to the Thessalonians, about May, 52, said,

1 Thess. v. 5. For you all are sons of light
And sons of day.

And St. John, at the end of the century, will record how our Lord said,

John xii. 36. As you are having the Light,
Be believing on the Light,
In order that you may become sons of light.

DD

But the word "children," though it represents the same Hebrew or Aramaic word as "sons," is used here, *Eph.* v. 8, as suggesting a natural relationship rather than an official position.

The passage illustrates St. Paul's readiness to pass from one metaphor to another. First of all, he speaks of his readers as light. Then they are children of light. And now "the fruit of the light" consists in every form of goodness and justice and truth. Beyond question, as we propose to show, the true reading is "the fruit of the light," and not "the fruit of the spirit," the latter phrase being taken from *Gal.* v. 22. Our Lord used the word "fruit" of His disciples as branches in Him, the True Vine, *John* xv. 2. St. Paul has employed it in reference to the result of sin, *Rom.* vi. 21. And within a few months, he will dictate the phrase, "fruit of justice," *Phil.* i. 11.

The fruit of the Light consists in goodness, justice and truth. Of "justice" we have already spoken, *Eph.* iv. 24. "Goodness," *agāthōsūnē*, has been excellently discussed by Trench in his *Synonyms* lxiii. It is only found in Greek versions of the Old Testament, in St. Paul, and in books dependent on these. In the Greek of *Ecclesiastes* ix. 18, it is used in the sentence, "One man, sinning, will destroy much goodness." But in the same book, vi. 3, 6, a man's life, however long it may have been, is counted vanity, if his soul was not "satisfied with goodness," and if "he did not see goodness," this last word, as Wright says in his *Ecclesiastes* p. 375, evidently standing for the enjoyment of life, and not for any moral or spiritual good. In the Greek of *Psalms* xxxviii. 20, according to the Alexandrian manuscript, and in that of *Psalms* lii. 3, the word is used of moral conduct, opposed to wickedness or malice. And in the Greek of *Nehemiah*, ix. 25, 35, it is used of God's beneficence towards Israel.

St. Paul, alone of New Testament writers, uses the word. He does so four times. In *Gal.* v. 22, written about the summer of 49, he places the word between kindness and faith or faithfulness. In *2 Thess.* i. 11, written about August, 52, he prays for his readers that God may fulfil every delight in goodness and work of faith in power. In *Rom.* xv. 14, written about January, 57, he tells his readers of his conviction,

Rom. xv. 14. That yourselves also are full of goodness,
Having been filled with all the knowledge,
Being able also to admonish one another.

Apparently, then, the word implies something more active than *chrēstōtēs*, "kindness," or "benevolence"; and we may render it as "goodness," in the sense of active goodness or beneficence.

The parenthesis within the parenthesis was formed by the lines,

Eph. v. 9. For the fruit of the light is in every [kind of] goodness
And justice and truth.

Now the Apostle resumes the original parenthesis, the new line forming a parallel to that already given.

Eph. v. 8c. Be walking as children of light,
10. Proving what is well-pleasing to the Lord.

To the Thessalonians, he has already said,

1 Thess. v. 21. But be proving all things.

And later, he urged the Roman Christians, saying,

Rom. xii. 2. But be being transformed in regard to the renewing
of the intelligence,

Unto the end that you may prove what [is] the
will of God—

[That is, what is] the good and well-pleasing and
perfect.

Here, in *Eph.* v. 10, as in that passage to the Romans, he connects the proving with what is well-pleasing to our Lord and God the Father. The verb, rendered "prove," means primarily to assay metals, so to test with good results, and hence to approve. Godet, in his commentary on *Romans*, explains the verb in xii. 2, as "appreciate," "discern."

As to the Greek word for "well-pleasing," *eu-árestos*, Deissmann, in his *Bible Studies* p. 215, has shewn that it is found in a possibly pre-Christian inscription of Nisýros. The adverbial form occurs in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* III. v. 5, in a pre-Christian inscription, 2885 in the *Corpus of Greek Inscriptions*, and in Epictétus.

The parenthesis is closed; and St. Paul resumes his original theme of the disobedient. He broke off at the line,

Eph. v. 7. Be not therefore becoming co-partakers with them.

Now he resumes with the lines,

Eph. v. 11. And be not communicating with the works,
The unfruitful [works] of the darkness,

But rather even expose them.

We notice, first of all, that the Apostle uses the word "works" of the darkness, and describes its works as fruitless. But he has employed the word "fruit" of the light, *Eph.* v. 9. It is a remarkable coincidence that nearly twelve years ago, in writing to the Galatians, v. 19, 22, he enumerated the "works" of the flesh, and illustrated the "fruit" of the Spirit. Further, as he passes here from "co-partakers," or "co-partners," to "communicating," or "having fellowship with," so five years ago, he asked,

2 Cor. vi. 14. For what partnership have justice and lawlessness ?

Or what fellowship has light with darkness ?

And four years ago, in *Rom.* xiii. 12, 13, he spoke about "the works of darkness," and named them. Such undesigned coincidences have a value in confirming St. Paul's authorship of the epistles, in which they are found ; and they, therefore, have their place in documentary criticism. In exegetical criticism, their value is still greater, as such words and phrases have evidently become almost technical, and significant of permanent elements in the thought and preaching of the Apostle.

Now he urges his readers to expose that wickedness, but not necessarily by speaking about it. A holy life by itself can reveal the condition of its environment. No doubt the verb *ēlénchō* may be rendered on occasion as "reprove," or "rebuke." However, the next line,

Eph. v. 12a. For [as to] what are happening in secret by them, suggests "expose" as more suitable to the context. This is confirmed by St. Paul's use of the verb in

1 Cor. xiv. 24. He is being exposed by all :
He is being searched out by all.

25. The secrets of his heart
Are becoming manifest.

The same rendering is the best in

John iii. 20. For he, who is practising worthless things,
Is hating the light.

And he is not coming toward the light,
In order that his works may not be exposed.

And the verb will be used in the same sense by Artemidórus

of Ephesus, between 138 and 161 A.D., in his *Oneiro-critica* ii. 36, a work on the interpretation of dreams.

As we have seen, the Apostle has already, in *Rom.* xiii. 13, named those deeds. It is, therefore, a powerful hyperbole, which he adds now.

Eph. v. 12. For [as to] what are happening in secret by them—

It is shameful even to say.

Then he passes beyond those special matters to things in general, or rather to the whole of things in general taken together, as *pánta*, "all things," with the article, implies. So he says,

**Eph. v. 13. But all the things, being exposed,
Are being manifested by the light.**

It may be objected that the phrase "by the light" may be taken equally well with "being exposed," as it comes in the Greek between the two verbs. We suggest in reply that the parallelism favours our construction. And the meaning of the couplet is made clear, if we turn from the general principle to the Apostle's particular direction. Christians must expose the secret deeds, *Eph.* v. 11. By that exposure, the real character of those deeds is manifest. But it is light which makes manifest. Therefore, those deeds are being made manifest by the light. In the present case, that light consists of Christians, who are light, *Eph.* v. 8. But the influence does not stop there. Not merely will those deeds be manifested in the light, but they will be utterly transformed. So the Apostle has said to his readers,

**Eph. v. 8. For you were sometime darkness ;
But now [you are] light in [the] Lord.**

Similarly, their light does not merely hold the surrounding darkness at bay, or simply illumine the objects in that darkness. But it has power to change the very darkness into light, and to convert actions from evil to good, from darkness to light,

**Eph. v. 13c. For everything, which is being manifested,
Is light.**

Now St. Paul closes this section on Christian Light with three lines from a Christian hymn. The rhythm of the words is very simple.

ě'geirě, hǒ katheúðǒn,
kaì anásta ěk tǒn nekrǒn,
kaì ěpipháusei soi hǒ Christós.

As the question is introduced by the words, "Wherefore he says," some have argued that it must be scriptural. But, because it is not found in the Bible, others, such as St. Jerome, in Vallarsi vii. 647, have referred it to an apocryphal work. Epiphanius, who became bishop of Salamis in Cyprus about 368, mentioned the *Prophecy of Elijah* as the source of the words. George Syncellus, a monk, who lived about 792, suggested a book by Jeremiah. Later still, the uncial, Boernerian G, of the ninth century and the Western type, named the *Book of Enoch* in its margin.

Cramer's *Caténæ* vi. 197, of 1842, quotes from Severian, bishop of Syrian Gabala, who acted as St. Chrysostom's deputy in Constantinople in 401. Explaining this passage, that student of the Scriptures connects it with 1 *Cor.* xiv. 26, in which St. Paul says that each one has a psalm. So Severian would refer the quotation in *Eph.* v. 14, to one of those spiritual psalms, composed by means of a

spiritual gift. This view is again expressed by Theodoret, consecrated for Syrian Cyrus about 423. And certainly, the passage bears the stamp of a Christian hymn, just as we find traces of a Christian creed in

1 Tim. iii. 16. Who was manifested in flesh,
Was justified in spirit,
Was seen by angels,
Was proclaimed in [thé] nations,
Was believed in [the] world,
Was assumed in glory.

The Apostle, it will be noted, introduces his quotation in connection with the work of the Christian light, that light being identified with Christians. In the quotation itself, the light is identified with Christ.

Eph. v. 14. Wherefore he says :

“ Rouse ! who art lying down asleep,
“ And stand up from among dead men,
“ And the Christ will shine upon thee.”

The Greek word *ègeirē*, the present imperative of the active voice, is not to be taken as “ be rousing [thee].” It is rather an exclamation, “ Rouse ! ” “ stir ! ” “ rise ! ” as in the *Iphigenia in Aulis* 624, of Euripides, staged after his death in 406 B.C., and in the *Frogs* 340, of Aristophanes, performed in 405 B.C. Some cursive manuscripts and some editions of ecclesiastical writers give *ègeirai*, the first aorist or indefinite past tense of the imperative mood in the middle or reflexive voice ; but that would mean “ rouse [some one] for me.”

The word *heúdōn* means “ sleeping ” ; but in the text, it is compounded with *katá*, which implies “ down ” or intensifies the simple form. So we may render it “ lying down asleep.” Then *aní-sta*, “ up-stand,” found also in *Acts*

xii. 7, Theocritus and Menander, is a short form for *anastēthi*, the second aorist or indefinite past tense of the active imperative.

The word for "shine upon" has had a strange history. It is simple enough in itself, as it is derived from *epi-phaúskō*, which occurs in the Greek Vulgate of *Job*. No doubt the *ph* in the word *epi-phaúsei*, "he will shine upon," is similar to *ps*. So some copyist made the change. The word then appeared as *epi-psaúsei*, "he will touch." And St. Jerome, vii. 647, tells how he once heard some preacher offer a brand new interpretation to please the congregation, who stamped their feet in approval. The orator said that the words, "Christ will touch thee," referred to our Lord's Blood and Body in contact with Adam's skull, from which the hill had been named Calvary. This reading, "Christ will touch thee," has been preserved in the Benedictine edition of St. Augustine on *Ps.* iii. 9, vol. iv. col. 77, and in the old Roman edition of Ambrosiaster in his comment on this passage. The attribution of it by Cramer's *Caténæ* vi. 196, to St. Chrysostom is due to a scribe's blunder; and indeed the reading has no support among the Greek witnesses. Some person went further, and added an *s* to the verb, so that it meant "thou wilt touch." Therefore Victorinus, about 360 at Rome, presents the phrase in his commentary as "thou wilt touch Christ." This is also found in some manuscripts of Ambrosiaster, who wrote at Rome under Pope Dámasus, 366-384. It was quoted by Paulinus of Nola, ix. 2, xxxii. 20, who was baptised in 391, and ordained in 393. It appears in the Latin translation of Origen's works, ii. 400, iii. 78, made by Rufinus after his return from the East in 397.

The first line of St. Paul's quotation,

Eph. v. 14b. Rouse! who art lying down asleep,

or simply,

Awake ! thou who art sleeping,

has been referred to

Ps. xliv. 23. Awake ; why wilt thou sleep, O Lord ?

and to

Is. lx. 1. Arise, shine, for thy light has come,
And the glory of Jehovah has risen [as the sun]
upon thee.

The second line,

Eph. v. 14c. And stand up from among dead men,

has been traced without much success to

Is. xxvi. 19. Thy dead ones will live :
My dead bodies will arise.

And the third line,

Eph. v. 14d. And the Christ will shine upon thee,

has with more reason been connected with

Is. ix. 2. The people, who [were] walking in the darkness,
Saw a great light.

[As to] the dwellers in the land of the shadow of death,
Light shone upon them.

Before leaving this section, it may be well to reflect for a moment on the part played by light and enlightenment in Christian and anti-Christian imagery. Already, in this encyclical, we have had the expression,

Eph. i. 18a. [You], enlightened as to the eyes of your heart.

And now we have had this section, steeped in the same figure of speech. The verb "to be enlightened" is found in *Heb.* vi. 4, and x. 32, and the metaphor in 2 *Cor.* iv. 4, 6, *Eph.* iii. 9, 2 *Tim.* i. 10, *Apoc.* xxi. 23, *John* i. 9. In St. Justin Martyr's *Dialogue* c. cxxii., which took place in 132 A.D., and in his *First Apology* i. 61, 65, of 150 A.D., enlightenment is connected with baptism. Then the Syriac Peshitta or Vulgate of 411, and the Harklean Syriac of 616, render the verb in *Heb.* vi. 4, by "descended to baptism" and "were baptised."

It has been suggested that such language and imagery have been borrowed by Christians from the pagan Mysteries. But, as Cheetham points out in his Hulsean Lectures on the *Mysteries, Pagan and Christian* p. 143, those who make such statements do not bring forward one instance in which the word "enlightenment" is applied to pagan Mysteries, though the sacred objects and acts were shown in a bright light to the initiated.

In the history of thought, the term "enlightenment" has been applied to those crises, when men passed from routine and convention to conviction and a recognition of customs and institutions, laws and beliefs, as embodiments of reason. It appears also as a crisis in the story of men and women, when they are passing from youth to adult life. Seen in them, it is, to a superficial glance, only self-assertion and a revolt against the traditions of the family, the nation, and the state. It is certainly subjective, individualist, and sometimes insolent. In the history of philosophy, it constituted the period of the Athenian sophists. This Greek Enlightenment was well represented by Protágoras, who arrived at Athens about 450 B.C., Pródicus, about 436, and Górgias, in 427. It expressed itself clearly in the assertion of Protágoras that "a man is the measure of all things : of those which are, that they

are ; of those which are not, that they are not," Plato's *Theætétus* 152, Diogenes Laertius ix. 51.

In the French Enlightenment of the eighteenth century, the assertion of the individual self against any objective or external expression of social reason, or supernatural revelation, may be said to have begun with an English work, the *Christianity not Mysteriorious* of John Toland in 1693. The next step was taken by Voltaire's *Philosophical Letters*, published after his visit to England in 1726-29. The position then was empirical, deist, constitutionalist. The third step was that of Diderot's *Encyclopedia*, 1751-1772, which became a text-book among the French people, and dissolved their respect for all religion, law and institutions. The last step consisted in the *System of Nature*, which was published under Mirabaud's name in 1770, for this book tried to explain everything by matter and motion.

The German Enlightenment found its most potent voice in Kant, who himself wrote an essay in 1784 on "What is Enlightenment?" He held the primary purpose of man's nature to be advance in Freethinking. And, therefore, he would not have such advance checked in the interests of any existing social laws or institutions. All knowledge certainly implied material in the shape of perceptions, sensations and sense-affections. But according to Kant, the individual mind itself possessed the twelve categories, in unity, plurality and totality ; reality, negation and limitation ; substantiality, causality and reciprocity ; possibility, actuality and necessity. With these, it moulded the material into the form of rationality ; and that rationality constituted the truth of the cognition. Space and time also are subjective, in this account of them ; and they are as native to the mind as the categories. If, then, causality be a form of thought, how could we use it to prove soul, an external world, or God? And such was the

question of those, to whom Kant's *Kritik of Pure Reason* came in 1781. To meet their difficulty, he published the *Kritik of Practical Reason* in 1788, in which he would establish the existence of God, freedom and immortality ; but the proof lies within the self-consciousness and internal experience of the individual.

The English Enlightenment was due to Hamilton. The Kantianism of his *Lectures on Logic and Metaphysics*, published in 1860, after his death, was accepted by Mansel, and Mansel's, published in his Bampton Lectures of 1852 on *The Limits of Religious Thought*, and later in his *Metaphysics*, was popularised by Spencer, in his *First Principles*, in 1862. But it was Stuart Mill, who did most to develop the phase. It would be difficult to exaggerate the influence, which he has exercised over English minds by his *System of Logic*, which first appeared in 1843, and by his *Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy* in 1865. In the latter work, he says frankly, c. xi. last note, "I do not believe that the real externality to us of anything except other minds, is capable of proof." And having resolved the external world into "guaranteed possibilities of sensation," he "resolves Mind into a series of feelings, with a background of possibilities of feeling," c. xii. As the French Enlightenment finally resolved sensations into matter and motion, the English Enlightenment finally resolved matter and motion into sensations. And as the former ended in Atheism, the latter subsided into Agnosticism.

The word "enlightenment" has passed into popular speech ; and its implications are indicated by its parentage. We can see its opposition to Christian enlightenment. Its centre is the individual man, not the Ideal Man, realised in God's Incarnation. Its rule and measure is that of the man himself, not that of God in Christ. Its life is individualist and protesting, not social and concordant. Over

against its self-assertion stands the Christian ideal of self-renunciation in the service of God and human souls. At times, it speaks with a high moral tone and a devotion to humanitarian purposes. It owes both to Christian doctrine and Christian example.

Eph. v. 9a. A Disputed Reading, "light."

There is nothing to cause any hesitation with regard to the word "light." The alternative reading "Spirit" is not only badly supported by the witnesses, but it is plainly introduced from *Gal. v. 22*. Still a question of this kind, in which the solution is clear and certain, has the greatest value for us, as it enables us to know the worth of the various witnesses.

The word "Spirit" is found first of all in St. Chrysostom's homily, xviii., *on Ephesians*, that is before 398. Thence, it passes to Theodoret, consecrated for Syrian Cyrus on the Euphrates in 423. It appears in the Harclean Syriac in 616. And of course, it will be found in the Damascene between 717 and 741. Then it appears in four ninth-century witnesses, the second corrector of the Claromontanus, D^c, the first corrector of the Sangerman, E^b, the Moscovian K and the Angelic L, the last two being undoubtedly Syrian. And among the cursives, which support the word "Spirit," we may mention 37, of Cent. xv. The reading then is strictly Syrian.

The word "light," as we should expect, is supported by all forms of the text.

The Neutral witnesses include both the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, both probably of the year 331 and Caesarea.

The Alexandrian witnesses are the Alexandrian A, of the early fifth century, and the Porphyrian P, of Cent. ix., among the uncials. To these we add the cursive 17, of

Cent. ix. or x., and the corrector of the eleventh century 67, both Alexandrian in character. There is also the Bohairic version, made for northern Egypt about 200 or 250. Although we depend on Cramer's *Caténæ*, vi. 194, for Origen's reading, we may certainly reckon him, the head of the Alexandrian School from 203 to 231, as on the same side, because the word is essential to his argument. With these witnesses, we must include the Alexandrian Euthalius, whose edition of the Pauline epistles in 458 is preserved in a manuscript of 1301. St. Jerome might very well be added here, because his commentary of 388 is practically Origen's. Indeed, that work may be classed with the Alexandrian witnesses; and his Latin Vulgate of the Pauline epistles, with the Old Latin, of which it is a modified form.

The Latin witnesses to the word "light" include Victorinus and Ambrosiaster at Rome about 360, Lucifer of Cagliari in Sardinia, p. 218, who died in 371, the Latin Vulgate of 385, the Gothic version, affected by the Old Latin after 568, the Western Text of Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., its copy, Sangerman E, of Cent. ix. and the twin uncials, Augien F and Boernerian G, of Cent. ix., and chief of all, the Old Latin Text itself.

The Syrian witnesses include the printed text of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, as in the edition of Gallandius, iii. 403. Most probably this is correct, as that Father was consecrated for Cappadocian Caesarea about 240, and so preceded St. Chrysostom and the Syrian Text by a considerable period. Other Syrian witnesses in favour of "light," and against the Syrian reading "Spirit," are the Syriac Peshitta of 411, the Armenian version, made after 431, the Ethiopic version, made about 600, and the cursives, 179, of Cent. ix. or x., 47, of Cent. xi., 6, of Cent. xiii., 213, of Cent. xiv., and 10, of unknown date and value.

Eph. v. 15-17. Christian Wisdom.

As the first of the five commandments had reference to Christian Love, and the second to Christian Light, the third is concerned with Christian Wisdom. St. Paul expresses it in this fashion :

Eph. v. 15. Therefore, be looking exactly how you are walking,

[And do] not [walk] as unwise, but as wise.

The word "therefore" goes back beyond the results of light and darkness to the command,

Eph. v. 8. Be walking as children of light.

And for the seventh time in this encyclical, the verb "to walk" is used of conduct. The verb "look" is used elsewhere, as in *Col. iv. 17*, *Phil. iii. 2*, by St. Paul in that same sense of "look-out," "be on the watch." It is employed very much as here by him in

1. Cor. iii. 10. But each shall be looking how he is building up.

More difficult is the word, rendered "exactly." Its meaning is sufficiently plain, though its derivation is not certain. St. Paul employs the adjective *akribēs*, in its superlative form, of the Pharisees, *Acts xxvi. 5*, because they were most exact, accurate and scrupulous in obedience to the Jewish Law. And the meaning, "exactly," suits the adverb *akribōs* on its other occurrences in *Matt. ii. 8*, *Luke i. 3*, *Acts xviii. 25* and *1 Thess. v. 2*.

But the difficulty of the word has regard to its position. If it should be placed before "how," then the readers must look exactly. If after "how," then they must walk exactly. After much hesitation, we have decided to place it before "how" for two reasons. First of all, that reading would be able to explain the alternative one. For if the

original text was *akrībōs pōs*, "exactly how," then the *pōs* could easily be omitted, as by the Ethiopic version, in copying or translating a manuscript, which did not separate the words. Afterwards, *pōs* could be restored, and that as easily before as after *akrībōs*, if the scribe did not see that the verb "be looking" is modified by "exactly," as "walking" is modified by the line that follows.

Then some of the testimony for placing "exactly" before "how" is very ancient. It includes the Bohairic version, made for northern Egypt about 200 or 250, and Origen, head of the Alexandrian School in 203, his text being given in Cramer's *Catenæ* of 1842, vi., 195, 196. These are supported by the two Neutral uncials, the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, both probably of Caesarea and the year 331. Then there are the opening words of St. Chrysostom's homily xix. on *Ephesians*, delivered before 398, and containing this reading twice. There are also cursives, 17, of Cent. ix. or x., 31, 73 and 80, of Cent. xi., and 118, of Cent. xii.

In favour of reading "how exactly," there are first of all Victorinus and Ambrosiaster at Rome about 360, Lucifer of Cagliari, p. 195, who died in 371, and St. Jerome's Vulgate of 385 and commentary of 388. Early in the fifth century, there are five witnesses, the Alexandrian uncial A, Pelagius, who wrote his commentaries on St. Paul at Rome before 410, the Syriac Peshitta of 411, Theodoret of Syrian Cyrus, consecrated about 423, and the Armenian version, made after 431. In the sixth century, we have the Greek in Claromontanus D. In the seventh century, we find the Harclean Syriac of 616, and the second corrector of the Sinaitic, *κ*^o. In the ninth century, we have the Western uncials, Sangerman E, which is a copy of D, the Augien F and its twin the Boernerian G, with their Old Latin versions, f and g. And to these we must add the

Porphyrion P and the Syrian uncials, the Moscovian K and Angelic L.

Now the line,

Eph. v. 15b. Not as unwise, but as wise,

has the subjective negative, *mē*, because it is dependent on the command, which we attempt to make explicit by rendering the words,

[And do] not [walk] as unwise, but as wise.

Here the emphasis is on the theoretical aspect ; but this view is enlarged to include the practical, when the Apostle forbids his readers to be "senseless," the two words, "unwise" and "senseless," completing one another. So he adds,

Eph. v. 16. Buying out the season for yourselves,
Because the days are evil—

17. On account of this [need to walk so], do not be
becoming senseless,
But comprehend what [is] the will of the Lord.

We retain the translation "season" or "opportunity" for the Greek word, *kairós*, though some may argue that here it only means time, as *chrónos* would do. Certainly, in the strangely similar passage, found in Theodotion's Greek version of

Dan. ii. 8. I know that you are buying out a season,

expresses Nebuchadnezzar's view that the Chaldean magicians were procuring delay. The original Aramaic means,

Of a surety, I [am] knowing
That you [are] buying the time,

that is, gaining time, the Syriac Pēshittā or Vulgate rendering the form, "you [are] asking for time."

But even so, we need not ignore the difference between this word *kairós*, "season" or "opportunity," and *chrónos*, "time." If we do render the former by "time," it must be understood that it is in the sense of "time, filled with opportunity." Butcher, in his *Harvard Lectures on Greek Subjects*, holds that *kairós* has no single or precise equivalent in any other language. He defines it as "that immediate present, which is what we make it: Time charged with opportunity, our own possession to be seized and vitalised by human energy, momentous, effectual, decisive; Time, the inert, transformed into purposeful activity."

The *ex-*, prefixed to the verb "buy," suggests "out" or "off," not "up." This is confirmed by the letter of the Smyrnaean Christians *on the Martyrdom of Polycarp* ii. 3, written soon after the martyrdom of St. Polycarp on Saturday, the 23rd of February, 155. There it is said that the martyrs were "*buying off* the eternal punishment for themselves by means of one hour." We add the words "for themselves," as we have already added "for yourselves" in translating *Eph.* v. 16, to express the middle or reflexive form of the verb. There need not, therefore, arise any question as to the salesman. St. Chrysostom, however, before 398 A.D., in homily xix. on this epistle, suggests the persecuting pagans. Severian of Gabala, about 401, and according to Cramer's *Catenæ*, of 1842, on this place, thinks that the time is bought out from evil men in general. And Calvin boldly said "the Devil."

Ramsay, in his *St. Paul, the Traveller* p. 149, happily omits the suggestion of a salesman by translating the line, "making your market fully from the occasion"; and he uses it to show how St. Paul "advised his pupils to learn

from the surrounding world everything that was worthy in it." Seneca, in his first epistle, writes, "Gather up, and preserve the time," the idea being repeated from his tract *on the Shortness of Life* i. It is interesting to note the similar thoughts of the two men at that same moment. The one man was the Semite Paul, a prisoner in his own lodging. The other was the Spaniard Seneca, owner of two millions and a half sterling, and nominally adviser, as he had been tutor, to the Emperor Nero. We have, however, pointed out that Seneca may have been a Semite, and that he was certainly influenced by Athenodorus of St. Paul's city, Tarsus.

St. Paul has already used the expression,

Eph.v.16a. Buying out the season for yourselves,
in

Col. iv. 5. Be walking in wisdom [with regard] to the [men]
without,

Buying out the season for yourselves.

This, Lightfoot paraphrases simply as letting no opportunity slip them of saying and doing what may further the cause of God. In the present passage, the Apostle adds,

Eph. v. 16b. Because the days are evil.

But there is no connection with Jacob's speech to Pharaoh,

Gen. xlvii. 9. The days of the years of my life have been few
and evil.

For Jacob is referring to his exile with Laban and his mourning for Joseph. St. Paul, on the other hand, uses the word in its moral sense. This is more suited to the time of Nero, an evil day, *Eph.* vi. 13, growing worse till its culmination three years hence in the fire of Rome and the martyrdom of Christians.

To walk as wise, the Apostle's readers must not become senseless, unwise in practical matters. But they must comprehend what is the will of the Lord. He had spoken of this to the Roman Christians, four years before, when he urged them, saying,

Rom. xii. 2. But be being transformed in regard to the renewing of the intelligence,

Unto the end that you may prove what [is] the will of God,
[That is, what is] the good and well-pleasing and perfect.

Eph. v. 18-20. Christian Gladness.

The fourth commandment will deal with a very practical matter. Faithful Christians could not take part in the civic banquets or club feasts, as these were always involved in idolatry and often in impurity. Instead, they had their *ägāpai*, or "love-feasts," to express their brotherhood. Though such feasts were a continuation of our Lord's Last Supper, and were followed by the Holy Eucharist, yet it was possible for Christians to forget the purpose, 1 *Cor.* xi. 17-34, and for false and unholy teachers to share the feast and degrade it, 2 *Pet.* ii. 13. Ultimately, such malpractices caused the Church to substitute fasting communion for the love-feasts, as the need of guarding against similar scandals led to communion under one kind. But while the love-feasts lasted, they were occasions of gladness; and St. Paul's direction refers to the character of the gladness. This should be the fruit of the Spirit, *Gal.* v. 22, and not due to the fruit of the vine. For this purpose, St. Paul takes the sentence,

Prov. xxiii. 31. And be not being drunk with wine.

Such was the rendering in the Greek Vulgate, according to the Alexandrian manuscript and Origen's testimony. The Hebrew literally means,

Thou shalt not see wine when it is red.

St. Paul, however, is not quoting the words as recognised Scripture. He is simply taking well-known words from a popular translation, and making them Scripture.

When he adds,

Eph. v. 18b. In which is prodigality,

it is plain that the prodigality is not in the wine, but in the being drunk with wine. Therefore, we render the words,

Eph. v. 18. And be not being drunk with wine,
In which [drunkenness] is prodigality.

The word *asōtía*, "prodigality," has occasioned questioning. Some derive it from *a*, "not," and *sōzō*, "I save," and explain it as "not to be saved." Others refer us to Homer's *Iliad* ix. 393, 424, 681, and derive the word from *a*, "not," and *sōō*. But this verb is merely the Epic form of *sōzō*. Then, the *Alcibiades* iii., of Plutarch, who was a student in 66 A.D., and the *Paedagogue* ii. 1, of the Alexandrian Clement, before 195 A.D., imply the connection of the noun with *asōstos*, "incapable of being saved." But the derivation and the use of the word connect it with the active form of the verb, and interpret it as inability to save. It therefore means a wastrel, not a losel.

Plato's *Republic* was begun before his visit to Sicily in 389 B.C. In that book, viii. 560, 561, he tells how a young man's conceited opinions will expel his temperance as unmanliness, and his moderate expenditure as boorish

illiberality, in order to enthrone Insolence as Good Education, Anarchy as Freedom, *Prodigality* as Magnificence, and Shamelessness as Manliness. Aristotle, whose *Nicomachean Ethics* were left unfinished at his death in 322 B.C., takes up the word *asōtia*, "prodigality," in that work, IV. i. 3-5. He says that it ought to be applied only to the wasting of one's substance. Then he represents it as an excess, liberality being the mean, and illiberality the defect. But his protest implies that the word is commonly used of those who are incontinent and extravagant in regard to intemperance.

The Greek Vulgate of *Proverbs* was made after that of the Law, which was made under Ptolemy Philadelphus, 284-247 B.C., and before that of *Sirach*, which we date in 132 B.C. It, xxviii. 7, employs the word *asōtia* for the Hebrew *zōl'lim*, a plural participle, meaning "squandering [men]," "prodigals," from the verb *zālāl*, "to shake," "to shake out," or "pour out." Then the Alexandrian Jew, who epitomised Jason's *History* in his own *Second Maccabees* before Philo and the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, and probably about the time of the Incarnation, uses the word, 2 *Macc.* vi. 4. Describing the pollution of the Temple under Antiochus IV., named Epiphanes, or the "Manifest" [God], in December 168 B.C., he tells of the indecent orgies, which took place in the Temple courts. And he connects the word *asōtia* with *kōmos*, "a revel." So it would appear that the sense of the word, against which Aristotle had protested, still prevailed.

We now reach the period of the New Testament. There the adverb is used in *Luke* xv. 13; and the phrase, "living prodigally," is used again by Josephus, in his *Antiquities* xii. 4, 8, published in 93 A.D. The noun is used in 1 *Pet.* iv. 4, written in the spring of 63, A.D. There it refers to excess in carnal and idolatrous sin. And in the autumn

of 65 A.D., St. Paul will stipulate that a presbyter's children shall not be chargeable with *asōtia*, "prodigality," *Tit.* i. 6.

So we may retain the translation, "prodigality"; but at the same time, we should recognise an implication of sensuality.

In contrast to being filled with wine, St. Paul urges,

Eph. v. 18c. But be being filled by [the] Spirit.

The Greek phrase is literally "in spirit." It cannot mean "with the Spirit," for the Greek verb "fill" cannot be constructed with "in" as meaning "with." But "in" may indicate the instrument. So the question is whether "in spirit" means "in your spiritual nature," or "by the instrumentality of the Holy Spirit." The other occurrences of the phrase in this encyclical ii. 22, iii. 5, and vi. 18, as well as its less doubtful use in *1 Cor.* xii. 3, 13, *Rom.* xv. 16, suggest the latter meaning, "by the Holy Spirit." This is confirmed by the contrast in *Acts* ii. 15-17, between the filling with wine and the descent of the Holy Spirit, and by that in

Rom. xiv. 17. For the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking
But justice and peace and joy by [the] Holy
Spirit.

Then there follows a passage which virtually repeats one already written to the Colossians. In the earlier statement, the Apostle had said,

Col. iii. 15. And the peace of the Christ shall umpire in your
hearts,
Unto which [peace] you were called in one body;
And be thankful [*eucháristoi*].

16. The word of the Christ shall indwell in you
Richly in all wisdom.

[You shall be] teaching and admonishing yourselves
[that is, one another]
With psalms, hymns, spiritual songs, in the grace
[of God],
Singing in your hearts to God.

17. And everything whatever—if you do [it] in word or
in work—
[Do] all things in [the] name of [the] Lord Jesus,
Giving thanks to God [the] Father by means of
Him.

Now, in his encyclical, the Apostle again insists on such
spiritual recreation, saying,

- Eph. v. 18c. But be being filled by [the] Spirit,
19. Talking to yourselves [that is, to one another]

With psalms and hymns
And spiritual songs,

Singing and harping
With your hearts to the Lord.

20. Giving thanks always
On behalf of all

In [the] name of our Lord, Jesus Christ,
To [our] God and Father.

It has been happily suggested that the singing to one
another implied antiphonal chanting, such as Pliny, in the
autumn of 112, described in his *Epistle* x. 97, to the Emperor
Trajan, when he told how the Christians of Pontus and
Bithynia used to sing alternately to Christ as God. St.

Paul, it is true, is not speaking of liturgical services, but of social gatherings. Still, the recreative character of the meetings would not be inconsistent with antiphonal and sacred song. His mention of psalms recalls those of the Old Testament and similar compositions. The hymn was strictly a rhythmical praise of God. And the songs might include any lyric, but are limited in the present case by the word "spiritual." The verb, *psállontes*, which we have rendered "harping," is the source of the word "psalm." That noun originally meant the twanging of the harp or lute, then instrumental music, and afterwards, a song so accompanied. The verb also passed through stages, from meaning "to touch," "to twang," "to play a stringed instrument with the fingers" instead of a plectrum, "to play" in any wise, and finally, "to sing to a harp accompaniment." But as the word "singing" is found in the same line in our present passage, it will be more reasonable to interpret *psállontes* of instrumental than of vocal music. The music, under its double form, is made "with the heart." St. Chrysostom, who interpolates "in" from the parallel passage in *Col.* iii. 16, explains his phrase "in the heart" as heartily. But Westcott, commenting on the true Greek Text, p. 82, suggests that the outward music should be accompanied by the inward music of the heart.

The thanksgiving must be on behalf of all. The word "all" may be masculine or neuter. Theodoret, consecrated about 423, explained it of men. But St. Jerome in 388, probably following Origen, and St. Chrysostom, between that year and 398, had interpreted it of adverse circumstances. St. Chrysostom had in an oratorical mood included even hell among such subjects for thanksgiving. We cannot, however, but recall how grand an illustration of obedience to the command was offered by his own life, his very last words being the refrain, which we can hear so

often on the lips of the Irish poor, "Glory be to God for all things! Amen."

Eph. v. 21. Christian Submission.

The fifth commandment has regard to Christian submission. It seems a very short passage and out of proportion. But it is really connected with those, that follow. It supplies the verb "subordinate" to the opening sentence of the next section. And it is applied to Christian wives in *Eph.* v. 22-33, to Christian children in vi. 1-4, and to Christian slaves in vi. 5-9. It may by contrast have suggested the great passage regarding Christian resistance, vi. 10-18.

The words seem simple enough.

Eph. v. 21. [You shall be] subordinating yourselves to
one another
In [the] fear of Christ.

St. Jerome draws the attention of bishops to the verse. For, though his language even to the "youth," St. Augustine, did not lack due reverence, his relations with the order were not always of the most agreeable character. Indeed, it is only natural that each of us should apply the command to those, who will not give way to us. The submission, which is evidently mutual, must be in the fear of Christ. In *Acts* ix. 31, and in *2 Cor.* v. 11, we find "the fear of the Lord." This, of course, is not a slavish or servile fear, or a sense of terror and dread; but it is that fear or reverence of Jehovah, which is the beginning of knowledge and of wisdom, *Prov.* i. 7, ix. 10.

Writing in 95 A.D., St. Clement of Rome seems to paraphrase this line in his passage,

xxxviii. Therefore let our whole body be being saved in Christ Jesus ;
 And let each be subordinating himself to his neighbour,
 According as he also was placed in his grace [or, his special ministry of grace],
 Let not the strong man be careless about the weak one,
 But let the weak man respect the strong one.

It is worth a moment's pause to consider the stupendous revolution, which St. Paul is voicing in the few verses before us. It is true that we cannot resolve authority with Bentham's *Principles* ii. 14, into the fear of other men, nor with Paley's *Moral and Political Philosophy*, at the end of its chapter on "the Moral Sense," into the fear of hell. Nor can we assert with Green's *Prolegomena to Ethics* § 324, that "it is the very essence of moral duty to be imposed by a man on himself." Green indeed tried to resolve that atomic doctrine pantheistically by explaining the sense of personal responsibility as due to the Infinite Spirit's communication of Itself to the human soul, § 319. We certainly do not follow him in his attempt. Nor do we think that account of authority adequate, which is given in the *Types of Ethical Theory* ii. 105, though it is robed in the varied splendour of Martineau's eloquence. There the objective authority is found within oneself, where conscience recognises a divinely ordered hierarchy among the springs of action.

No doubt, it should be man's delight to repeat the song of McAndrew's engines,

"Law, Orrder, Duty an' Restraint, Obedience, Discipline !"

But a still more inspiring motive is needed for such a revolution as that, which St. Paul is proclaiming. Now, it is true that authority is embodied reason. However

much old rules may be ill-fitted to the new circumstances, they did represent reason and not caprice. This is evidenced by the straits, which men will suffer in adapting an old law to a new life, the Jews offering us an interesting illustration of this every day. Ultimately, of course, the rule must claim God's authority, but not the authority of His Will alone. It is the Nature of God that is the source of Good and Right. And whether we speak the language of Goodness and Moral Perfection or that of Right and Law, there can be no suggestion of caprice in the Final Fount of Authority.

There is, however, an important element in the question. It is easily overlooked, though St. Paul has urged it throughout this encyclical. He has indeed compared the Church, the Catholic Society, to a Temple and to a Body. The one figure presented it statically and the other dynamically. But interwoven with those interwoven metaphors, there is always the recognition of its nature as a communion of souls with God and one another. Here, then, we may say, the great principle is not merely to be a person and to treat others as persons, but to be a person in Christ, and to treat others as persons in Christ. It is true that the degradation of a person to a thing is a wrong against the person, a crime against the State, and a sin against God. But the principle fails us now, because it is less than the truth. For it is not the degradation of a merely human and natural person, that is before us. It is the degradation of one, who partakes of the Divine Life and is a friend of God, living in union and communion with Him. In this sphere, authority then is exercised under such awful responsibility, that reflecting men have asked if a superior can be saved. For here, the indulgence of caprice or the wanton humiliation of another in the name of authority is cognate with blasphemy and sacrilege.

Under such conditions, there is nothing unduly exacting in the command,

Eph. v. 21. [You shall be] subordinating yourselves to one another
In [the] fear of Christ.

But there is much that is revolutionary in the application of the principle. St. Paul does not require the subordination of the father to the mother, child, or slave. But by establishing the larger principle, which holds each ruler to be also a subject, he influences the whole social order of the Church, and can the more easily gain smaller concessions for the family life.

It was a strangely heterogeneous body, which was formed by those Christians of metropolitan Ephesus and its friendly cities, the commercial Laodicea, Hierapolis, the fashionable watering-place, and the declining Colossae, trading in violet wool. Those Christians would include convert Jews, convert Greeks, convert Phrygians, and convert Romans. Of these, it will be sufficient for the moment to take the last, whom Vergil, their prophet, in his *Æneid* i. 282, described as

“ Romans, the lords of the world, and the race, entitled to wear the toga,”

that is, the imperial robe of peace. St. Paul's aim, as we know, was the conversion of the Roman Empire. That attained, Christian principles would permeate the subject nations.

The Roman family was regarded as in the absolute control of the head, the *paterfamilias*, or “father of the family.” Over his wife, he exercised the *potestas manus*, the “power of the hand.” It is true, as Sheldon Amos says in his *Roman Civil Law* p. 258, that the absoluteness or

unrestricted control of the *manus*, or "hand," over the wife, that of the *potestas*, or "power," over the children, and that of the *dominium*, or "ownership," over the slaves, varied greatly at different times. For example, Justinian's *Institutes*, published on the 21st December 533 A.D., represent a very different state of affairs from that pictured in the *Institutes* of Gaius, compiled between 160 and 180 A.D. And the power of the *manus*, or "hand," over the wife practically ceased under Constantine and the other Christian emperors. But those changes mark the triumph of Christianity. According to the older rule, the wife was in much the same position as her children. As Shuckburgh points out in his *Augustus* p. 227, it became fashionable among Roman ladies to refuse the indissoluble tie, lest they should pass "into the hand" of a husband. So they were married *sine manu*, "without hand," and remained subject to the *patria potestas*, the "paternal power," or that of their guardians, if they were not *sui juris*, independent.

As to his children, the *paterfamilias* exercised unlimited *potestas* or "power." He was sole lawgiver, judge and executioner. As Gaius confesses in his *Institutes* i. 55, p. 21. in Abdy and Walker's edition, "there are scarcely any other men, who have such *potestas* with regard to their own children as we [Romans] have." No restriction was made, till a law of Valentinian and Valens, about 364-375 A.D., forbade the chastisement to reach *in immensum*, "an enormous amount." Until then, the law formally recognised a father's right to punish, torture, or kill his children.

Over the slave, the *paterfamilias* had absolute *dominium*, the fullest right of "ownership." He could use the slave as a thing in any available way. Therefore, at the merest whim of his master, or at the suggestion of his mistress,

the slave could be scourged, mutilated or crucified. This power was not restricted, till a law of Antonius Pius, 138-161 A.D., held the master liable to an accusation of culpable homicide. Juvenal and other writers of the earlier period have pictured the horrors of the slave's lot in their day. We may also remember how one newly enriched person, named Vedius Pollio, would not listen to the entreaties of the Emperor Augustus, his guest, but ordered a slave, for dropping a crystal cup, to be thrown to lampreys, which he fed on human flesh. Of such a condition, Tertullian, in his appeal *to the Nations*, written before his lapse in 199, offers us another illustration. He tells us, I. xvi., of a Roman child, stolen from his noble parents, carried to Asia, and after some years, brought back and exposed for sale in the slave-market in Rome. The father, ignorant of the relationship between them, buys him, subjects him to foul dishonour, and then sends him in chains to work in the fields. There the lad is discovered by the slaves, who had been his tutor and his nurse, the discovery being followed by the parents' suicide.

Bearing these things in mind, we can read between the lines of St. Paul's directions. He is sending the runaway slave, Onesimus, back to his master, Philemon, with a letter, which is destined to achieve much for slaves in time to come. Now in this encyclical, he insists on the submission of wives, children and slaves. But while he does so, he propagates the principles of the most revolutionary movement in the history of our race.

Eph. v. 22-33. The Submission of Christian Wives.

To the Colossians, the Apostle has just said,

Col. iii. 18. Wives, subordinate yourselves to your husbands,
As was fitting in [the] Lord.

The Greek is literally, "the women" and "the men." But we may present the former term as "wives," for the article in the Greek Testament sometimes, as in *Matt.* xi. 26, *Mark* v. 41, and *Luke* viii. 54, indicates the vocative or nominative of address. The word for "men," or "husbands," is not the plural of *ánthrōpos*, the Latin *homo*, a human being, but *anēr*, the Latin *vir*, "a man," as distinguished from woman and child. As in *Eph.* v. 4, we have retained the imperfect form, "was fitting." And that past tense, as in our own word "ought," Lightfoot points out in his *Colossians* p. 227, may imply an essential *a priori* obligation.

In this encyclical, the direction takes this form,

**Eph. v. 22. Wives,—to your own husbands,
As to the Lord.**

Their subordination must be as to the Lord, that is, our Lord. For if it were to a lord, the plural would be used in the case of many wives. Further, it is our Lord, who is the source of Christian authority as our Lord. But the verb is omitted; and it must be supplied from the more general direction of St. Paul's fifth commandment, which has immediately preceded.

Eph. v. 21. [You shall be] subordinating yourselves to one
another

In [the] fear of Christ.

Some of our witnesses have attempted to complete the expression. This was necessary when, like the Alexandrian Clement, and the Cappadocian Basil, they needed to quote the verse without its predecessor; and in the arrangement by Euthalius, the verse begins a new chapter, no. 9.

Some Western witnesses, Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., its copy, the Sangerman E, of Cent. ix., the Augien F and

its twin the Boernerian G, of Cent. ix., with the Old Latin columns in D, E and G, and the lectionary 19, of Cent. xvii., borrow the word *hupo-tássesthe*, "subordinate yourselves," from *Col.* iii. 18, and insert it in a similar position after "wives" in *Eph.* v. 22.

The word is borrowed, and added after "husbands," by some Syrian witnesses, such as St. Chrysostom, before 398, the Syrian Peshitta in 411, the Harclean Syriac in 616, and the two uncials, Moscovian K and Angelic L, both of Cent. ix.

Some other witnesses went off to St. Paul's decision regarding the behaviour of women in the churches, and borrowed the word, *hupo-tassésthōsan*, "let them be subordinated," from 1 *Cor.* xiv. 34. It was natural enough that St. Clement, head of the Alexandrian School from 189 to 202, should supply the verb when he quotes the verse by itself, p. 308, though he omits that verb, when he quotes the verse in connection with the preceding one, p. 592. The Bohairic version, made for northern Egypt about 200 or 250, inserts the same verb. Probably in 331, we find it in the Sinaitic Aleph at Caesarea. About 360 and at Rome, we find it in Victorinus and Ambrosiaster. St. Basil, 329-379 A.D., quoting the verse without its predecessor in his *Morals* ii. 309, of the Benedictine edition, will imitate the Alexandrian Clement in borrowing the verb from 1 *Cor.* xiv. 34. In 385, it will reappear in St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate. After 397, it will be seen in the Latin translation of Origen, iii. 61b. A few years later it will be contained in the Alexandrian uncial A, then in Theodoret, consecrated about 423, and in the Armenian version, made after 431; next in Euthalius, the Alexandrian deacon in 458; afterwards in the Gothic version, affected by Old Latin Texts after 568, in the Ethiopic version made about 600, in the Damascene, between 717 and 741, in the Old Latin

Text in the Augien f, of Cent. ix., and in the Alexandrian Text of the cursive 17, of Cent. ix. or x.

On the other hand, the verb, in any form, is not to be found in the Alexandrian Clement, p. 592, when he quotes the verse with its context, nor in the Vatican uncial B, probably belonging to Caesarea and the year 331. Further, the Latin translation of Origen can hardly represent him, for St. Jerome, who had inserted the verb in his Latin Vulgate of 385, omits it in his commentary of 388, vii. 654c, Vallarsi's edition, on the distinct ground that it was not found in the Greek manuscripts. And it will be remembered that St. Jerome wrote that commentary under the influence of Origen's works.

St. Paul now adds the reason why the wife's submission should be as to the Lord.

**Eph. v. 23. For a husband is head of the wife,
As also the Christ [is] head of the Church,—
[Being] Himself Saviour of the Body.**

Since grace builds on nature, and both orders, the supernatural and the natural, come from the same God, we are not surprised to find an analogue of one in the other. True, we are dealing with a figure of speech in each case; but the real objects and relations are not less rich, but richer than the metaphors, which represent them.

Nearly six years ago, in the autumn of 55, St. Paul wrote from Ephesus to the Corinthians, saying,

**1 Cor. xi. 3. And I wish you to know that
The Christ is the head of every husband,**

**And the husband is the head of the wife,
And God is the head of the Christ.**

We may say by-the-way that we have here rendered the

Greek *de* as "and," because it corresponds in this place to the Hebrew letter *waw*, "and." To show the connection of the thoughts, we have translated the words for "man" and "woman" as "husband" and "wife," as we did in *Eph.* v. 22. In *Corinthians*, however, the reference is to conduct in the church, and in *Ephesians*, to conduct in the home. The latter is naturally connected with the doctrine of this encyclical, in which we have been told how God subordinated all things under the feet of the Christ,

Eph. i. 22. And Him, He gave [as] Head
Over all things to the Church.

To show what is the dynamic relation of our Lord to the Church, His static position being pictured as Head of the Body, St. Paul adds,

Eph. v. 23c. [Being] Himself Saviour of the Body.

Therefore, in his measure, however small it be, it is also the husband's duty to protect his wife. It is no mere assonance, then, which suggests the phrase, *sōtēr tou sōmātos*, "saviour of the body." Nor does the Apostle add the line to mark a difference between the relation of the Christ to the Church, and that of the husband to the wife. In urging such a view, Calvin overlooked the dependence of the argument upon the analogy between the relations. For the reasoning is by analogy. As the Christ to the Church, so is the husband to the wife.

It is necessary to remember that the word "Saviour" was not at that time restricted in its application. Literally it means "deliverer" or "preserver," and was applied to Apollo, as by Æschylus in his *Agamemnon* 512, in 458 B.C., to the serpent which Pergamum worshipped as Asklēpios or Æsculapius the Saviour, and to Zeus or Jupiter the Saviour, in whose honour banqueters drank their third

cup of wine *Pindar*, I. vi. 11, about 468 B.C. It was given to a river, deified as a Saviour from temporal ills, *Herodotus* viii. 138, about 445 B.C. It is even given to personified Fortune by Sophocles, in his *Œdipus the Despot* 81, between 440 and 410 B.C., and by Æschylus, in his *Agamemnon* 664, in 458 B.C. It was readily given to Augustus by the inhabitants of the Eastern Mediterranean, who not only worshipped him from afar with temples and sacrifices, and kept the first day of the month as the Augustan or Emperor's Day, but even offered him personal adoration, Suetonius, *Augustus* xcvi., Deissmann, *Bible Studies* p. 218. So much was given him, because he had given them rest from war, as the same honour had been given to Pompey by the people of Mitylene, when he crushed the pirates in 67 B.C. But even Nero was described in an inscription at a later time as "Saviour of the inhabited [world]." True, the Christian religion took the word, and charged it with eternal and supernatural meaning. In doing so, it did not forbid the word to imply such preservation and deliverance, as the husband should offer his wife. And in the present passage, it indicates the analogy between the husband's office in regard to his wife, and the Christ's in regard to His Church.

The next couplet has but one difficulty. That is in its opening word, the conjunction *allá*, "but," with adversative force.

Eph. v. 24. But, as the Church is subordinating herself
to the Christ,
So also [let] the wives to the husbands in
everything.

The difficulty is caused by the assumption that this new statement is in some way opposed to the preceding. The key to the solution, however, is found within the section,

for the *allá*, "but," could be omitted without injuring the sense here or in *Eph.* v. 27, as *plēn*, "however," in *Eph.* v. 33. Taking this in connection with the imperatives, we may suspect another meaning in the adversative conjunction. This, like the Latin *tandem*, may be used with the imperative to persuade. Examples will be found in Pindar's *Odes* vi. 37, and several times in *Homer*. It may indeed be used in quick transitions, as in the *Iliad* i. 134, 140; or it may mean "well" or "now" in such phrases as "well, come," and "come, now." And Curtius, in his *Greek Grammar* § 630, obs. 2, points out that it frequently serves to break off a long discussion and to introduce a request emphatically.

To prepare the husbands for a statement of their duties towards their wives, St. Paul describes the love and work of the Messiah or Christ for the Church. This would be a familiar theme to those who had been Jews, and accustomed to think of Jehovah as not only the King and the Father, but also the Husband of Israel. It would be too prosaic to quarrel with the metaphors on the ground of their mutual inconsistency. Only by weaving one metaphor with another, as St. Paul is interweaving the metaphors of Temple, Body and Bride, can the imagination attempt to embody truths of the supernatural order.

On the eighth day of Passover, the *Song of Songs* was read in the Synagogue to celebrate the marriage of Jehovah and Israel at the Exodus. Hosea, before 736 B.C., built up the most pathetic of lyrical prophecies on the figure, *Hos.* ii. 19. Isaiah sustained the theme, *Is.* liv. 5. Jeremiah repeated it at the time of his call in 626, and again at the approach of Jerusalem's Fall in 586, *Jer.* iii. 14, xxxi. 32.

Now the Apostle treats our Lord's oversight of the Church as an Old Testament prophet might have treated Jehovah's oversight of Israel. Yet the new picture is the richer by

the Incarnation and Crucifixion of Jehovah, and by the spiritual splendours of the Heavenly Jerusalem.

Writing to the Colossians, the Apostle only said,

Col. iii. 19. Husbands, love your wives,
And do not be embittering yourselves against them.

Now he writes,

Eph. v. 25. Husbands, love your wives,
According as the Christ also loved the Church,

And [as] He delivered up Himself on behalf
of her,

26. In order that He might sanctify her,

When He cleansed [her] with the washing
Of the water [conditioned] by an utterance,

27. In order that He might present—He Himself
to Himself—

The Church glorious,

Not having spot or wrinkle,
Or anything of such things.

But [He cleansed her] in order that she may
be holy

And unblemished.

St. Chrysostom finely indicates the purpose of this passage, when he describes the previous section as the measure of a wife's obedience, and this as the measure of a husband's love. Some have tried to find parallels between the bride's dower and the Christ's giving Himself, between the bride's bath and the Christ's cleansing of the Church, and between the presenting of the bride to her husband and the Christ's

presenting of the Church to Himself. St. Paul, however, is not dwelling on a bride's preparation to meet her bridegroom, but on the heavenly Bridegroom's work for His Bride, the Church. Now, it is only Messiah's activity that is in question. And the Apostle himself must stand aside, though nearly five years ago, in the summer of 56, he could write from Macedonia to the Corinthian Christians, saying,

2 Cor. xi. 2. For I gave you in marriage to one husband,
To present a chaste virgin to the Christ.

And even just now, he could speak of himself and other preachers as seeking to present every man perfect in Christ, *Col. i. 28*. But now, there is no intermediary and no direct reference to individual Christians. Messiah Himself will present His own Bride to Himself. Everything here is designed to emphasise the surpassing love of the Heavenly Bridegroom for the Heavenly Bride.

To the Ephesian elders, gathered at Miletus, on Saturday April 30, 57, St. Paul gave command for them,

Acts xx. 28. To shepherd the Church of God,
Which He acquired by means of His own Blood.

But he had already, writing to the churches of South Galatia in 49 A.D., connected Messiah's death with His love, when he spoke of his own faith in the Son of God,

Gal. ii. 20. Who loved me,
And delivered Himself up for me.

And in this encyclical, we have met the same conjunction of ideas,

Eph. v. 2. And be walking in love,
According as the Christ also loved you ;
And [as] He delivered up Himself
On behalf of us.

Now, however, the Church as a whole is substituted for her members, and St. Paul dictates,

Eph. v. 25. Husbands, love your wives,
According as the Christ also loved the Church,

And [as] He delivered up Himself on behalf of her,
26. In order that He might sanctify her.

So the "you" and "us" of *Eph.* v. 2, are supplanted by "the Church."

The immediate object of our Lord's self-surrender is to sanctify and cleanse the Church. The two verbs, "sanctify" and "cleanse" are both in aorist or indefinite past time, so that neither antedates the other. In accordance with our mode in similar cases, we render the participle by "when He cleansed." Notwithstanding the difference of mood, the two verbs placed side by side in the Greek Text, represent the negative and positive aspects of the one act. The baptismal cleansing of a man's sins, the sanctifying of his soul by grace, and the justifying him by making him just, are not separated by intervals of time. St. Paul used the same aorist or indefinite past tense with regard to each, when he wrote to the Corinthians,

1 Cor. vi. 11. But you washed off [sins] from yourselves,
But you were sanctified,
But you were justified,

In the name of the Lord, Jesus Christ,
And in the Spirit of our God.

Our Lord's suffering and His work of sanctifying souls are also connected in

Heb. xiii. 12. Wherefore Jesus also—
In order that He might sanctify the people by
means of His own blood,
—suffered outside of the gate.

But the real difficulty in the present passage is found in the lines,

Eph. v. 26b. When He cleansed [her] with the washing
Of the water [conditioned] by an utterance.

If we begin with the words "water" and "utterance," baptism is suggested at once. There is certainly, as the Aristotelian scholastics, since William of Auxerre, about 1215 A.D., would say, water for the matter or indeterminate element, and an utterance for the form or determining element. The utterance is the more important; and so, our Lord, who had washed His disciple's feet, said,

John xv. 3. Now you are clean,
On account of the word, which I have spoken to you.

And St. Augustine in his homilies on *St. John's Gospel* lxxx. 3, begun in 406 and completed in 416 A.D., will argue that the water is but water without the word, which becomes a sacrament and, as it were, a visible word, when it approaches the element of water.

But it is necessary to consider two other words, that rendered "washing," and that in the phrase, "[conditioned] by an utterance." As to the former, its verb *louō* means "I wash." The middle or reflexive form would mean "I wash myself," or "bathe." Then *loutrōn* means a place for washing; and *loutēr* is *lou-tēr*, "laver," "washer," or "washing-basin." Now the word immediately before us is *loutrón*. This, according to such forms as *árō-trōn*, the Latin *ara-trum*, a "plough," that is, an instrument for ploughing, and *lú-trōn*, a "ransom," that is, an instrument for loosing, ought to be *lou-trón*, "a bath," that is, an instrument for washing, as in Xenophon's *Cyropædia*, vii. 5, and elsewhere, but generally in the plural form. So commentators, including even Abbott, dismiss the word at

once with the meaning of "a bath." However, the word is used for washing-water in the *Antigone* 1201, which Sophocles produced in 440 B.C.; and the phrase "washings of waters," that is, "waters to wash," is found in the same poet's *Ædipus at Colónus* 1599, brought out posthumously in 401 B.C. Armitage Robinson, who has devoted much attention to the matter, appeals, in his commentary on this passage, to the use of the word in the Greek Vulgate. There, in *Canticles* iv. 2 and vi. 6, it represents the Hebrew word *rachtsāh*, "washing"; and in *Sirach* xxxiv. 25, it means "washing." The word is used in that sense by St. Clement of Alexandria, head of the Catechetical School from 189 to 202 A.D., in his *Pedagogue* or "Tutor," III. ix. 46, written before 195 A.D., and by Dionysius, who held the same position from about 232 to 247, at the end of his epistle xiii., as well as by Epiphanius, consecrated for Salamis in Cyprus about 368.

The word *loutrón* will be used again by St. Paul in the autumn of 65, when he will tell how God, according to His mercy, saved us,

Titus iii. 5. By means of washing of regeneration

And [by means] of renewing of [the] Holy Spirit,

that is, "renewing by the Holy Spirit," the genitive being that of the agent. The two aspects, the cleansing and the sanctification, are clearly indicated in the verse. But for our immediate purpose, it is more important to note that *loutrón* is here parallel to "renewing," and therefore suggests its own meaning as "washing" rather than the washing-utensil, the bath.

Much controversy has been occasioned by the phrase, which we have followed Moule's commentary, p. 141, in rendering as "[conditioned] by an utterance." About the year 400, three doctors of the Church commented on the

expression. St. Jerome, writing his commentary on the encyclical in the year 388, in his Bethlehem cave, and under the influence of Origen's works, connected the "word" or "utterance" with the sanctifying. But the construction of the sentence and especially the parallelism hardly permit such an interpretation. St. Chrysostom, preaching on the encyclical at Syrian Antioch before 398, explains the "utterance" or "word" in his twentieth homily as the baptismal form "in [the] name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." And as we have seen, St. Augustine, between 406 and 416, at Hippo, about a mile south of the modern Bona in Algeria, in his homilies on *St. John's Gospel* lxxx. 3, refers the expression to the baptismal form, added to the baptismal water. Fortunately, we have a similar phrase in the next section of this epistle. There it is commanded the Christian child,

Eph. vi. 2. "Honour thy father and mother,"

Which [is such that it] is [the] commandment, first
[conditioned] by a promise.

In both passages, the Greek form may well be rendered as "conditioned by" or "accompanied by." So, in the present passage, it implies the union of word and water, and therefore suggests Christian baptism.

The Church is cleansed that our Lord may present her to Himself in the glory, which St. John exhausts symbolism to represent in the *Apocalypse* xxi. xxii. She will be without spot. The Greek word *spīlōs* means "a stain," literal or metaphorical; but it is not found in the Greek Vulgate. It appears to have been employed in the later time of St. Paul and Plutarch for the word *kēlīs*, of the same meaning. There is no difficulty as to the word *rhūtīs*, the Latin *ruga*, "wrinkle." The final phrase, "holy and unblemished" has already been used of individual

Christians in *Eph.* i. 4, as earlier in *Col.* i. 22. The word *a-mōmos*, "without blemish," "unblemished," is suggested both as to sound and meaning by the word of the Bridegroom to the Bride in

Cant. iv. 7. And there is no blemish in thee,

the Hebrew *mūm* being rendered *mōmos*, "blemish," in the Greek Vulgate.

Having said so much, St. Paul will be able to deal more definitely with a husband's duties. In order to strengthen his appeal, he will pass from the husband's headship in regard to the wife to his identity with her. This identity in the case of the Christ and the Church was taught to the Apostle himself at his conversion, when he heard the words,

Acts ix. 5. I am Jesus,
Whom thou art persecuting.

And St. Paul himself taught it, when he boldly spoke of the Church as the Christ, 1 *Cor.* xii. 12.

He will, however, commence with the figure of the head and the body. And still pointing to the Messiah's love for the Church, he says,

Eph. v. 28. So ought the husbands also to love their own
wives,
As [being] their own bodies.

That is simple; but one step in the next argument is suppressed.

Eph. v. 28c. He, who loves his own wife, loves himself,
29. For no one at any time hated his own flesh.

The second line is the reason or ground of the first, and is therefore expressed as a general principle. Seneca, St.

Paul's neighbour, and a more fashionable preacher, uttered the same thought in a more conventional way, when he wrote in his *Epistles* xiv. 1, "I confess that love of our own body is natural to us." We may put St. Paul's statement and Seneca's in logical form as the major proposition,

All men are lovers of their own bodies.

Now, as to the first line, it is based on the figure of speech, which represents a man's wife as his body. We may paraphrase the words, expressing them in logical form as,

All lovers of their own wives are lovers of their own bodies.

Still, we must explain the conjunction "for" in the second line. Does it imply that the first line as conclusion is proved by the second line as major and a suppressed minor? Or can it refer to a suppressed conclusion? Now it is evident that no conclusion can be drawn from those two lines as premises, because the middle term, "lovers of their own bodies," is not used in its full extent in either proposition, but is "undistributed" in both, as a logician would say. Westcott, however, in his commentary, p. 85, assumes a suppressed conclusion. He cannot, of course, argue that it is,

All men are lovers of their own wives.

So he suggests that it is,

The husband, therefore, must love his wife.

He formulates that conclusion with "must" instead of "is," although "must" has not appeared in his premises. And as we have seen, no conclusion at all can be drawn, because the middle term is undistributed.

On the other hand, if the first line is the conclusion, and

the second the major proposition, the suppressed minor must be

All lovers of their own wives are men.

The argument, therefore, seems very simple. The major proposition is,

All men are lovers of their own bodies, *Eph.* v. 29a.

The suppressed minor would run,

But all lovers of their own wives are men.

And the conclusion is,

All lovers of their own wives are lovers of their own bodies,
Eph. v. 28c.

Again, St. Paul draws an analogy between the earthly and the heavenly man. When he did so earlier in the chapter, he added,

Eph. v. 23c. [Being] Himself Saviour of the Body.

Now he will add the other aspect, already clearly expressed in *1 Cor.* vi. 15, xii. 27, and *Rom.* xii. 5,

Eph. v. 30. Because we are members of His Body.

As to the interpolated phrases, "out of His Flesh and out of His Bones," it will be better to deal with them separately. At the present moment, we must watch how the Apostle is leading up to the identity of husband and wife. The former never hates his own flesh,

Eph. v. 29b. But he rears [it] up, and fosters it,
According as the Christ [rears up and
fosters] the Church,—

30. Because we are members of His Body.

Here St. Paul uses the verbs, *ek-trēphō* and *thálpō*. The former, which will be used once more in the Greek Testament, *Eph.* vi. 4, with regard to children, suggests feeding and nourishing. The latter, used once already, *1 Thess.* ii. 7, implies warming, and hence fostering in the bosom. The argument is quite clear. As the Messiah cherishes His Body, the Church, so a man cherishes his body. But it remains to be proved that his wife is his body. This, St. Paul will do by the testimony of Sacred Scripture. The words are too well-known to need any formula of quotation, such as "it is written." Therefore he commences at once,

**Eph. v. 31. On account of this, a man will leave the
father**

And the mother ;

And he will cleave unto his wife,

**And the two will be unto [that is, become]
one flesh.**

The Apostle has led up to this quotation ; and he slightly anticipated it by using the expression, "his own flesh," in *Eph.* v. 29. It will serve him to prove the identity of husband and wife, that he may insist on the duty of the former to love the latter. Our Lord had used the passage to prove the identity of husband and wife, that He might insist on the duty of the former to cleave to the latter. St. Matthew, indeed, writing for Palestinian Jews, presents our Lord's saying in simple form, xix. 9. But St. Mark, writing for Gentiles, is obliged to prevent misunderstanding by forbidding divorce to the wife also, x. 12, such a prohibition being taken for granted by our Lord, as it was quite inconsistent with Jewish law and custom. So it is in St. Matthew's account, we see the more exact parallel

between our Lord's argument and that of St. Paul, who had so marvellous a comprehension of the Master's teaching.

The Apostle, as we have noticed, does not refer the quotation to an author. Those words of *Genesis*, ii. 24, are represented by the Council of Trent, Session xxiv., Nov. 11, 1563, as part of Adam's speech. Many commentators regard them as a comment by the narrator, who is the secondary author of the passage. But as God is its primary author, the sentence may be referred to Him, as it is by our Lord, *Matt.* xix. 5, unless indeed the words, "and He said," are used by the evangelist, as in verses 4 and 11, of our Blessed Lord Himself. At all events, when St. Paul, nearly six years ago, quoted the line,

1 Cor. vi. 16. The two will become one flesh,

his interjected word, "says He," referred the sentence to its primary author, God.

The quotation, forming our present subject, *Eph.* v. 31, is taken from the Greek Vulgate with two slight changes. The word "his" is omitted after "the father and the mother," and the Greek word *anti* is substituted for *hēnēkēn* to represent "on account of." This use of *anti* is sometimes compared with its employment in the phrase *anth'hōn*. That expression, however, hardly means "on account of which things," or "wherefore," but simply "because," as in *Luke* i. 20, xii. 3, xix. 44, *Acts* xii. 23.

Having pointed to the identity of husband and wife, St. Paul adds,

Eph. v. 32. This mystery is great,

But I am speaking [with reference] unto
Christ,

And [with reference] unto the Church.

GG

St. Paul here applies the word "mystery" to the relation between husband and wife. At the same time, he refers it to the relation between Christ and the Church, using the preposition *eis*, as it is used in *Acts* ii. 25, to signify "with reference unto." It is not necessary for us to trace fully the history of the Latin word *sacramentum*, used to render the Greek word for "mystery." Its employment to indicate the deposit, forfeited to the State by the loser in the antique form of civil action at Rome, is noted in the fourth commentary of Gaius' *Institutes*, compiled before 180 A.D. Interesting examples of its use to denote a military oath may be found in St. Jerome's First Epistle to Heliodorus in 373 A.D., and two centuries earlier, in Tertullian's appeal to the *Martyrs* iii., written about 197 A.D. Indeed, it would appear that Pliny, the legate propraetor of Bithynia, understood the Christian "sacrament," the "Mystery" of the Holy Eucharist, as an oath, when he wrote in the autumn of 112 A.D. from Amisus, now Eski Samsun, on the Black Sea, to the Emperor Trajan.

It is, however, our immediate business to find St. Paul's meaning, and its relation to the sacramental doctrine of marriage. Now the word "mystery" in the Pauline epistles is set over against the word "revelation." The former means a Divine secret in *1 Cor.* ii. 7, iv. 1, xiii. 2, xiv. 2, xv. 51, *Rom.* xi. 25, xvi. 25, *Col.* i. 26, 27, ii. 2, iv. 3, *1 Tim.* iii. 9, 16. It requires such a sense on its six occurrences in the present encyclical, *Eph.* i. 9, iii. 3, 4, 9, v. 32, vi. 19. There is only one other instance of the word in St. Paul. He uses it in the phrase, "the Mystery of the Lawlessness" in *2 Thess.* ii. 7. Josephus, in his *Wars* I. xxiv, 1, of which the Aramaic original appeared in 69 or 70 A.D., describes Antipater's life as "a mystery of wickedness," both words lacking the article. By that, Josephus implies its secrecy. So "the Mystery of the Lawlessness" is a

secret ; and it is a mystery or secret, which has reference to the Divine plan.

The Divine secret in the identifying husband and wife is part of the Divine secret in the Incarnation. This is now revealed ; so we can read God's purpose in man's headship over creation, *Gen.* i. 26, and the design in His own eternal Will to form the Church, *Eph.* i. 4.

But what relation has this passage to the sacramental doctrine of marriage ? Time would fail us to recount the numerous explanations, which have been composed to disprove any such connection, or to prove such a connection to be complete. But as Cornelius à Lapide, in his commentary on this place, points out, some of those statements overlook the reference of the word " this " to the marriage of Adam and Eve. Some Latins read " in Christ and in the Church," interpreting the phrases of the Christian Religion and the Christian Church. Others strangely describe the Church as leaving her father, the Devil, and her mother, the world of unbelievers, to cleave to Christ.

In the Pauline sense of the word " mystery," a Divine secret, the marriage of Adam and Eve was a mystery, or, as a type of the Christ and the Church, involved a mystery. By an inspired word, their marriage is declared representative. Not only of their wedding, but of every case, in which a man becomes one flesh with his wife, is it said,

Eph. v. 32a. This mystery is great.

But to be a sacrament in the theological sense of that term, it must be more than a type or a sacred sign. It must first of all be a sign of sanctifying grace. This is implied in the present passage, because the Messiah's union with the Church involves her sanctification, as we have seen, *Eph.* v. 26. And that union is adduced by the Apostle as analogous to this union of husband and wife.

Then, to show that marriage in this passage is a sacrament of the Gospel, we must show that St. Paul's words imply a difference between Christian and other marriages. This is implicit in the motive, which he suggests for the husband's conduct ; because that motive depends on a consciousness of the Messianic import in marriage. Now, according to the sacramental doctrine of marriage, the union of unbaptised persons is not a sacrament, till they have been baptised, and, say some, have explicitly renewed their marriage contract. Then, the marriage of unbaptised persons, who are outside the order of sanctifying grace, is not quite parallel to the marriage of Adam and Eve, who were then in a state of grace, *Gen.* i. 26. That primal marriage involved both the identity of persons and the state of grace, which are realised in the truly Christian marriage.

The sacramental doctrine of marriage is therefore implied in the Apostle's argument ; but it is not explicitly taught. With this agrees the word *innuit*, " he intimates," or rather, the verb being used in a late sense, " he hints," used by the Council of Trent, session xxiv., with regard to St. Paul's sacramental teaching in this passage. Like Imperial rescripts, St. Paul's encyclical naturally implies much that need not be expressed explicitly, having regard to the relation between writer and readers. As the Imperial rescripts, building up the Civil Law of the Roman Empire, breathed an atmosphere of Roman life and tradition, so the Pauline epistles, helping to build up the doctrine of the Catholic Church, breathed an atmosphere of Catholic life and tradition. And the work of an interpreter is not always a prosaic effort to ascertain exactly what his author has explicitly said. For often it taxes all he has of intuition, sympathy and historical imagination to discover what his author takes for granted or known.

Now the Apostle breaks off his statement of doctrine to sum up his practical directions for husband and wife. As in 1 *Cor.* xi. 11, and *Phil.* iii. 16, he resumes with the word, *plēn*,—

**Eph. v. 33. However—you also—the [men being taken]
one by one—**

Each shall so love his own wife as himself.

But the wife—

In order that she may fear the husband.

St. Paul uses the expression “you also” to imply “you, as well as the Christ.” And he makes a personal appeal to each man, saying not only “each,” but also “one by one,” that is, individually, severally. We usually find *heis*, “one,” and *hēkastos*, “each,” combined in the form, *heis hēkastos*. Now instead of *heis*, we have *kath’ hēna* the preposition *katá* marking the distributive use of *hēna*, the accusative of *heis*. This phrase then means “one by one”; and it is here used with the plural article to signify “the [men, being taken] one by one.”

In the last clause, the principal verb is omitted, as in 2 *Cor.* viii. 7, because it is so easily supplied. And as to the wife’s fear of her husband, the fear, as the fear of Christ in *Eph.* v. 21, and the fear of parents in *Lev.* xix. 3, means reverence, and not slavish fear. When Aristotle, in his *Economics* I. viii., sketches a husband’s duties, he forbids the man to inspire the wife with fear, except such fear as is accompanied by reverence and respect. To make his meaning clearer, he would have the wife cherish such fear for her husband, as good sons have for their parents, and good citizens for kindly rulers, but not such as slaves feel toward their masters, or citizens toward tyrants.

St. Peter, as we have seen, knew this encyclical. And

he offers us an excellent commentary on the practical directions of this section in these words of his own first encyclical :

- 1 Pet. iii. 1. In like manner [as the domestic servants, you] wives,

Subordinating yourselves to your own husbands—

In order that, even if any are disobeying the Word,
They will be gained by means of the conduct of
the wives without a word,

2. When they watched your chaste conduct, [conditioned as it was] by fear.
3. Whose shall not be the outward adornment of
plaiting of hair,
And of encircling [yourselves] with golden things,
Or of investing [yourselves] with mantles.
4. But [yours shall be] the hidden man of the heart
In the incorruptible [adornment] of the meek and
quiet spirit—
Which [spirit] is very precious in the presence of
God.
5. For so sometime the holy wives also—
Who were hoping upon God—were adorning themselves,
Subordinating themselves to their own husbands.
6. As Sarah hearkened to Abraham,
Calling him "lord." [Gen. xviii. 12].

Whose children [that is, Sarah's] you became, doing
good,
And not fearing any consternation. [Prov. iii. 25].
7. In like manner [as the wives, should you behave],
husbands,
Co-dwelling [with them] according to knowledge,
As [co-dwelling] with a weaker vessel, [even] the
feminine [one],

Distributing honour,
 As to [those who are] also co-possessors [with you]
 of [the] grace of life,
 To the end that your prayers be not hindered.

Eph v. 30. A Disputed Reading, "out of His Flesh and out of His Bones."

It is a serious thing to reject the nine Greek words, if they are really Scripture ; and we are therefore bound to a careful investigation before setting them aside as a gloss.

First of all, it is urged that the words were omitted on account of their materialist view. That is not convincing ; so Alford, in his commentary iii. p. 139, suggests that they were omitted by *homoio-teleuton*, "like-ending," that is to say, the scribe, on looking back to the manuscript which he was copying, caught not the word-ending or word just copied, but the same ending or word in a later place, all the intervening passage being omitted by him in consequence. So it is implied that those scribes, who omitted the words in question, wrote the *autoû*, "his," after "Body," and looking back to the exemplar, caught the same word after "Bones," with the result that they omitted "out of His Flesh and out of His Bones."

There is much Western testimony in favour of the words. They are found in St. Irenaeus, who comments on them, *Heresies* V. ii. 3, *Mass.* 294, between 182 and 188 A.D. They appear in the Abbot Esaias about 350 A.D., according to the edition of Gallandi vii. 314c, in Victorinus of Rome, about 360, according to Mai's edition iii. 140, in Ambrosiaster of Rome, ii. 248d, under Pope Dámasus, 366-384 A.D., in Pacian of Spain, about 372 A.D., according to the edition of Gallandius vii. 262e, in St. Ambrose, i. 131ob, who was consecrated for Milan in 374, therefore evidently in the Old Latin, from which they passed into the Latin Vulgate of

the Pauline epistles in 385. Though St. Augustine twice, iv. 297c, 1438c, omits them, he quotes them in iii. 794; and they are used by Leo the Great, *Concil.* iv. 50b, who was Pope from 440 to 461. They are naturally found in the Latin column of the Claromontanus D, in Cent. vi. The Greek column of this uncial has suffered much assimilation to the Old Latin version, and contains the words. These pass in Cent. ix. into the Latin and Greek columns of Sangerman E, then copied from D. In the same century they appear in the Latin and Greek columns of the twin uncials, the Augien F and the Boernerian G.

The Syrian witnesses begin at Antioch before 398 with St. Chrysostom iii. 215b, 216a; viii. 272c; xi. 147a, b, c, d. Then, according to Cramer's *Caténæ* vi. 205, 208, of 1842, there is Severian of Gabala, who acted as deputy for St. Chrysostom in Constantinople in 401. About the same time, there is the Tarsian Theodore, who was a fellow-student with St. Chrysostom under Diodorus of Tarsus at Syrian Antioch from 374 to 378, and became first a presbyter there, and afterwards, from 392 to 429, bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia. He wrote a commentary on the Pauline epistles, and his quotation of the words, which we are discussing, may be found in his comment on the verse. Next in order comes the Syriac Peshitta, made at Edessa by Rabbûla in 411. Then follows Theodoret iii. 434, who was consecrated for Syrian Cyrus about 423, and depended on St. Chrysostom and Theodore. There is Nilus i. 95, 267, who had been prefect of Constantinople and became a monk of Mount Sinai. He was alive in 430. Next we have Anastasius, 1004a, 1007a, the Sinaitic monk, who became bishop of Antioch in 559, as well as the Harclean Syriac of 616, the second corrector of the Sinaitic uncial \aleph^c , in Cent. vii., and the Damascene ii. 190e, between 717-741. In the ninth century, there are the

uncials, the Angelic L, the Porphyrian P and the Moscovian K, the last, however, substituting the word "Body" for "Flesh." With these, we must class the cursives generally, especially noting 47, of Cent. xi., and 37, of Cent. xv.

The Armenian version presents "out of His Bones" in its manuscripts, and the full form, "out of His Flesh and out of His Bones" in its printed editions. It is, however, more important to know whether Origen read the words. Now Methodius of Tyre, who flourished in 290 A.D., and opposed Origen's doctrines, must have known Origen's works. According to the edition of Gallandius, he quotes the verse once without the addition, iii. 614b, and twice with it, iii. 688c and e, that is, in his *Symposium*, 54, p. 17 in Jahn's edition. Still, that does not necessarily imply that Origen read the words. A more serious argument is their employment by St. Jerome in his *Commentary on the Ephesians*, written in 388, under the influence of Origen's works. Still, it may be that St. Jerome repeated the words, as he had been accustomed to them in the Old Latin version, and had retained them in his Vulgate of 385. One resource remains. Rufinus, after his return from the East in 397, translated much of Origen, but very freely. He quotes the verse in his translation, iii. 61c, saying, "Because we are members of His Body," and adding *et reliqua*, "and the rest." Had the questioned words been before him in the text of Origen, it seems probable that he would have translated them. His own addition may have been suggested by the fact that he was accustomed to read the additional words in the Old Latin version.

Then, the words are supported by the Western Text, which is under suspicion of interpolation, and by the Syrian Text, which is charged with conflation. The explanation of their omission in other witnesses as an example of *homoio-*

teleuton is weakened by the number of those witnesses. These include the Bohairic version, made for northern Egypt about 200 or 250, the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, both probably of Caesarea and the year 331, the Alexandrian A of the early fifth century, the Alexandrian Euthalius in 458, according to the manuscript of 1301, the Ethiopic version about 600, the cursives, 17, of Cent. ix. or x., the corrector of 67, made in Cent. xi., and 8, of unknown date and value.

Then, the evidence in favour of omission is Neutral and Alexandrian. That in favour of inclusion is Western and Syrian.

Abbott urges that the phrases introduce an entirely different figure. We need not call on the defenders of the words to answer that, because we have seen that St. Paul does not hesitate to blend architectural, physiological and matrimonial metaphors. Then, it is asked what meaning could be given to "bones." It is true that St. Irenaeus, in his *Heresies*, V. ii. 13, gives occasion to the enemies of the words to blaspheme by referring them to our Lord's "Cup, which is His Blood," and "to His Bread, which is His Body." They point out truthfully enough that "Blood" and "Body" are not the same as "Body," "Flesh" and "Bones." And it must be confessed that the question as to the significance of the "Bones," becomes more serious, when attention is drawn to the prepositions employed

"Out of His Flesh, and out of His Bones."

The expressions were suitable to Eve, who was so derived from Adam, and described by him as "bone out of my bones, and flesh out of my flesh," *Gen.* ii. 23, according to the Hebrew Text and its Greek Vulgate. So we suspect that

the words were copied as a marginal note from that verse of *Genesis*. They would readily be suggested by the quotation of the next verse, *Gen.* ii. 24, in our next verse, *Eph.* v. 31. Alford would object that the words in *Genesis* are in a different order, "bones," preceding "flesh"; but that surely does not invalidate this account of their origin.

CHAPTER VI

PEACE AND WAR

It is unfortunate that Cardinal Langton of Canterbury, in 1204 or 1205, cut through the great passage on submission, *Eph.* v. 21-vi. 9, when he divided the book into chapters. This, the last chapter, deals with the submission of Christian children, *Eph.* vi. 1-4, and that of Christian slaves, vi. 5-9, the resistance of the Christian warrior, vi. 10-17, St. Paul's third prayer, vi. 18-20, the commendation of the bearer, Tychicus, vi. 21, 22, the Apostolic benediction, vi. 23, and St. Paul's postscript, vi. 24.

Eph. iv. 1-4. The Submission of Christian Children.

In the letter, which St. Paul has just written to the Colossians, he has said,

Col. iii. 20. Children, be hearkening to the parents according to all things ;

For this is well-pleasing in [the] Lord.

21. Fathers, do not be exciting your children,
In order that they may not be desponding.

Now he says,

**Eph. vi. 1. Children, be hearkening to your parents in
[the] Lord,
For this is just,**

2. "Honour thy father and mother"—
Which [is such that it] is [the] commandment,
first [to be conditioned] by a promise—
3. "In order that it may become well for thee ;
"And thou wilt be longlived on the earth."
4. And fathers, do not be provoking your
children ;
But rear them up in discipline and admonition
of [the] Lord.

The Christian rule in this regard is exemplified in our Lord's childhood, *Luke* ii. 51, and expressed in His teaching on His last journey, *Matt.* xix. 19, and its parallels, *Mk.* x. 19, and *Luke* xviii. 20, as well as on an earlier occasion in Galilee, *Matt.* xv. 4, *Mk.* vii. 10. On one occasion, indeed, our Lord showed that the commandment does not bind in the face of a direct call from God. Just as Abraham was bound to surrender his son to Him, who has the supreme dominion over life and death, so one of our Lord's more casual disciples was released from any obligation to "bury his father," that is, to stay at home till his parent died, if he had received a Divine call to more permanent discipleship, *Matt.* viii. 21, 22, *Luke* ix. 59, 60.

Neither the Mosaic Law nor the Church ever regarded this matter lightly. In *Leviticus*, it is treated with the utmost solemnity.

Lev. xix. 1. And Jehovah spoke to Moses,
Saying,

2. Speak to all the congregation of the sons of Israel,
And thou shalt say to them :

You shall be holy,
Because holy am I,
Jehovah, your God.

3. You shall fear,—each man,
His mother and his father.

And you shall keep My sabbaths :
I [am] Jehovah, your God.

So the reverence due to parents is actually inserted between holiness and the Sabbath. This is sufficient evidence of its importance. Then St. Paul, in *Rom.* i. 30, includes disobedience to parents among the sins, into which abandoned Gentiles fall. In *2 Tim.* iii. 2, he describes it as a mark of the final apostasy.

The word "parents," in *Eph.* vi. 1, includes both father and mother, as the succeeding verse shows. This is important, as confirming the interpretation of "fathers" in *Eph.* vi. 4, by "fathers and mothers," the parents of Moses also being described in the Greek of *Heb.* xi. 23, as "his fathers."

The encyclical will be read in Christian congregations ; therefore the appeal to the children is to those of Christian parents. These the Apostle has already, in *1 Cor.* vii. 14, spoken of as holy. The question of their baptism does not arise in this place, except so far as that sacrament is implied in their being within the apostolic jurisdiction. But we may for the present conclude from the baptism of households and the analogy of circumcision, that they had been baptised.

There is an ambiguity in the first line. According to Cramer's *Caténæ* vi. 208, of 1842, it was pointed out by Origen. The expression, "in [the] Lord," may be taken with "your parents," or with "be hearkening to." But the words ought not to be construed as "your parents in [the] Lord." The parents are indeed assumed to be Christians ; but the obedience would be due to them, were they pagans or Jews. The first motive adduced is that of

natural law, "for this is just," and the second motive is that of a Mosaic commandment. The natural law would support a pagan parent; and the revealed law of Israel, a Jewish. But here both are quoted to Christian children. The phrase, "in [the] Lord," therefore, belongs to the verb, and indicates the spirit of the obedience. This connection of the expression with the verb, and not with the noun, is confirmed by the direction to the wives,

Eph. v. 22. Wives, [be subordinating yourselves] to your own
 husbands,
 As to the Lord.

The Apostle does not rest the direction on its æsthetic or emotional value. He briefly notes that it is just, the act of a virtuous will. When he supports it by the Decalogue, he quotes from the Greek Vulgate of *Deuteronomy* v. 16, but omitting the word "thy" in connection with "mother." Some have objected to his description of this commandment as the first "in promise," that is, accompanied or conditioned by a promise. They point out that the prohibition of idolatry is followed by a promise of mercy, *Ex.* xx. 6, *Deut.* v. 10. The latter, however, is a general promise regarding those who love God. The promise, of which St. Paul speaks, is definitely attached to the honouring of parents. Others have argued that the word "first" ought to be "only one," because no other commandment is so emphasised. But the word "commandment" is not necessarily limited to the Decalogue or "Ten Words." Others again interpret "first" as "foremost," as pre-eminent in its promise. But St. Chrysostom points out, that the Apostle does not say first in respect of rank, but first in respect of promise. There are still others, who have urged that the commandment is called the first, because it was the first to be learned by children. But again,

it must be replied that the Apostle said "first in promise."

We said that St. Paul quotes the promise from the Greek Vulgate of *Deut.* v. 16, but omitting the word "thy" in connection with mother. In *Exodus* xx. 12, the word for "land" or "earth" is qualified by "the good"; and these words do not appear in St. Paul's quotation. Both recensions of the Decalogue describe the "land" as that "which [the] Lord thy God gives thee," this clause being significantly omitted by the Apostle. The land, therefore, is no longer limited to Palestine; the promise embraces the whole world; and we must translate the Greek word, *gē*, as "earth," instead of "land." Some have indeed applied the promise literally to the Chinese, their reverence for their parents, and their life in their land. But St. Paul did not erase the Palestinian boundary to substitute a Chinese one. Further, his quotation of the promise is to illustrate the importance of the commandment, not to present Christians with an earthly aim. At the same time, we should note that a long life on earth may be a very great blessing in its opportunities for exercising the pilgrim virtues of faith and patience.

Turning to the fathers, that is, as we have seen, to the parents, St. Paul forbids them to provoke their children. He has already, in *Rom.* x. 19, used this verb, "to provoke," in quoting the Greek Vulgate of *Deut.* xxxii. 21, where it is figuratively employed of God's provoking Israel and moving them to jealousy with an uncomprehending nation. But the prohibition of provocation is only the negative aspect. There is also the positive command that parents shall rear up and nourish their children. First of all, they shall do this "in discipline," that is, the process shall be accompanied and conditioned by discipline, this last word standing for training in general and systematic education.

Then, there is the special work of admonition and warning, *1 Cor.* x. 11, *Tit.* iii. 10. And finally, all this is to be the Lord's discipline and admonition, the parents being His representatives to train the child, as He wills.

Eph. vi. 5-9. The Submission of Christian Slaves.

There is at the present time a tendency to palliate the evils of slavery. Aristotle, we are reminded, could not acknowledge the possibility of abolishing it. In his *Economics* I. v., he holds that good slaves are necessary ; and in his *Politics* I. iv., he implies the same doctrine. Arguing in his own way from the intention of nature, he says that some men are as inferior as brutes to other men, and therefore slaves by nature, *Politics* I. v. 8. In such a case, he thinks there may be a mutual benefit and friendship between master and slave, which cannot be expected in the case of those who have been enslaved by custom or war and not by nature, *Politics* I. vi. 10. In this, both he and Cicero, *de Rep.* III. xxv. 2, 2, rise at all events above the Platonist recognition of slavery by war. But at the same time, we see that Aristotle's inability to condemn the institution of slavery followed from his inability to recognise the personality of every human being.

It has been urged of late that slavery was beneficial for the slave, as initiating him into a higher civilisation ; and it is true that some slaves were highly educated. It has also been argued that the system was beneficial for the community in providing leisure for some, and in supplying the means of accomplishing massive works. For example, in 309 B.C., 400,000 men and women in the condition of chattels enabled 21,000 Athenians to devote themselves to philosophy, commerce, or amusement. And many ancient structures have been raised at the same cost to interest

modern travellers with their ruins. God alone knows the total misery. Indeed, He alone fathoms all that many a case involved. To us, it must come as a shock, when we meet such a fact as the manumission of 8,000 slaves by the lad Pinianus and his girl-wife, the younger Melaneia, in 410 A.D.

But the highest thing in the natural order is personality. That is what a man is: the rest is what he has. By it, and in terms of it, we therefore measure natural progress. Slavery, however, as Martineau says in his *Types of Ethical Theory* i. 447, when judged in its historical place as the substitute for the earlier usage of putting all prisoners to the sword, "must be recognised as an indication of milder dispositions, and as a part of the real advance, which the law of development secures." Our own industrial revolution, notwithstanding its pangs and throes, its long-drawn tragedies and nightmare horrors, has made personal slavery almost impossible. By its effects in raising the masses to human life, with the promise and potency of more human conditions, it has shown that the line of development is in the direction of richer and nobler personality. This, of course, does not imply an individualist or anarchist order, for the personal life of men on earth, as of God eternally in heaven, is a social one. And this is not the least of the analogies between the two orders, the natural and the supernatural.

What then did St. Paul accomplish in this direction? He did not attempt to revolutionise the Empire, which he desired to convert. Even now, he is sending Onesimus back to Philemon. Revolts had failed. The Servile Wars of Sicily in 135 and 102 B.C., broke no chain. The Servile War of 73-71 B.C., under the Thracian Spártacus, was more formidable, but proved abortive. But one whisper, stealing over the world, and heard by one man here,

and by another there, awoke the consciousness of self-consciousness and of the dignity in human nature. Had that whisper been nothing, it had failed, as Stoicism failed. But it was not the natural personality of man, which St. Paul vindicated. It was his supernatural personality as identified with Incarnate God. The Eternal Son of God had taken the form of a slave, and died a slave's death, *Phil.* ii. 7. That was the doom of slavery. A human being, worth so much to God, could not be held a chattel.

But we must note how St. Paul, under Divine inspiration, sets to work. In the autumn of 55, he sends Titus from Ephesus, probably direct by ship, with his first letter to the Corinthian Church. In it, he addresses the slaves, who naturally formed a large portion of a Christian congregation.

1 Cor vii. 20. Each—in the calling, in which he was called—
Let him remain in this.

21. Thou wert called, [being] a slave ;
Let it not be a care to thee.

But and if thou canst become a free [man],
Use [it] rather.

22. For he, who was called in [the] Lord, [being] a
slave,
He is a freedman of [the] Lord.

In like manner, he who was called, [being] a free
[man],
He is a slave of Christ.

23. You were bought with a price :
Do not be becoming slaves of men.

24. Each—in what he was called—brethren,
Let him remain in this with God.

It is now the year 61 ; and the runaway slave Onesimus

has come to the Apostle's room in Rome. So St. Paul writes the most artless and persuasive of letters to win not only forgiveness, but also a new standing for the slave. He writes to the Christian congregation also, so that Philemon, Onesimus and others shall hear him speak on the subject in the tone of Apostolic authority. As he dictates that letter to the Colossian church, Onesimus is standing by, and listening.

Col. iii. 22. Slaves, be hearkening in respect of all things
To [those who are] the lords in respect of [the] flesh

Not in eyeservice as men-pleasers,
But in simplicity of heart, fearing the Lord.

23. Whatever you are doing,
Be working [at it] from [the] soul,

As [working] for the Lord,
And not for men,

24. Knowing that you will receive from [the] Lord
The full-recompense of [that is, which is] the possession.

Be slaving for the Lord Christ.

25. For he who did unjustly will get back what he did
unjustly ;
And there is no partiality.

iv. 1. Lords, be providing of yourselves the just and the
equality [that is, what is just and equitable] for
the slaves,
Knowing that you also have a lord in heaven.

But Philemon and Onesimus shall hear St. Paul's directions once more. And now, as he is dictating his encyclical for Colossae, as well as for Ephesus, Hierapolis and Laodicea, he practically reiterates what he has just

said in the *Epistle to the Colossians*, even repeating the Greek word for "eyeservice," which he seems to have coined for that letter. As God is unquestionably the slave's lord in regard to the slave's spirit, the Apostle commences,

Eph. vi. 5. Slaves, be hearkening

To [those who are] the lords in respect of
the flesh—

With fear and trembling
In simplicity of your heart—

As to the Christ—

6. Not according to eyeservice as men-pleasers,
But doing the will of God as slaves of Christ—

7. Out of [the] soul,
Slaving with goodwill,

As for the Lord,
And not for men.

8. Knowing that each—
Whatever he may do good—
Will get back this from the Lord—
Whether slave or free [man].

9. And lords, be doing the same [things] towards
them,
Giving up the [usual] threatening,

Knowing that the Lord, both theirs and yours,
Is in [the] heavens.

And there is no partiality
With Him.

The expression, "fear and trembling," *Eph.* vi. 5, has been used by St. Paul in *1 Cor.* ii. 3, and in *2 Cor.* vii. 15. It will again be employed by him in *Phil.* ii. 12. St. Mark, v. 33, applies it in verbal form to the woman, healed of an issue. It is a Greek Vulgate phrase, and does not appear to mean more than "with reverence and solicitude." It very probably represents the expression "fearing the Lord," connected in *Col.* iii. 22, with the phrase "in simplicity of heart." This last phrase also is from the Greek Vulgate, which employs it to render the Hebrew words for "in the uprightness of my heart," *1 Chron.* xxix. 17, and makes it parallel to goodness in

Wisdom i. 1. Love justice,
[You] who are judging the earth.

Think of the Lord in goodness ;
And seek Him in simplicity of heart.

The word "men-pleasers," also is probably derived by St. Paul from the Greek Vulgate, which renders the Hebrew *chōnākh*, "[he who is] besieging thee" in *Psalms* liii. 6, by "men-pleasers." The word is apparently borrowed from the psalm by the Pharisee, who wrote, iv. 8, 10, in the *Psalms of Solomon*, probably between 70 and 64 B.C. The meaning is very clear ; and St. Paul made it emphatic on the eve of his departure from Syrian Antioch for the Apostolic Council in Jerusalem. It was then, in 49 A.D., he wrote to the Galatian churches in Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, saying,

Gal. i. 10. For am I now appeasing men or God ?
Or am I seeking to please men ?

If I were yet pleasing men,
I were not Christ's slave.

In a similar strain, he wrote to the Thessalonians about May, 52, saying,

- 1 Thess. ii. 3. For our exhortation [did] not [proceed] out of
wandering [from the truth],
Nor out of uncleanness, nor in guile.
4. But according as we have been approved by God,
That the Gospel should be entrusted to us—
So we speak—
Not as pleasing men,
But [as pleasing] God, who approves our hearts.

As to the phrase "out of [the] soul," some have connected it here in *Eph.* vi. 7, with "doing the will of God," as it is connected with "working" in *Col.* iii. 23. And for a moment, it seems fair to divide the two phrases, "out of [the] soul with goodwill," that we may give one to verse 6, and the other to verse 7. But, first of all, the preceding parallels,

- Eph.* vi. 6. Not according to eyeservice as men-pleasers,
But doing the will of God as slaves of Christ,

evidently need no assistance from the verse which follows. Further, the phrase "from [the] soul" is in *Col.* iii. 23, connected with the verb "working," and may very well be connected here with the verb "slaving," "being a slave." Finally, the two phrases, "out of [the] soul" and "with goodwill," ought to be taken together; as "out of" or "from the soul" indicates the slave's view of his work, and "with goodwill," his view of his master. The latter phrase was very significant at a time, when Seneca, *Ep.* 47, could say that a man had as many enemies as slaves.

The verb *komizō*, in its middle or reflexive form, which

we have rendered "get back" in *Col.* iii. 25, and *Eph.* vi. 8, has already been used in

2 Cor. v. 10. For we must all be manifested
Before the judgement-seat of the Christ,
That each may get back
The things [done] by means of the body—
[With regard] towards what things he did—
Whether [it were] good or worthless.

And in the sentence,

Eph. vi. 9. And lords, be doing the same things towards them,
the Apostle assumes a reciprocal relation between master and slave. If the latter owes heartiness to his master's interests and goodwill to his master's person, as Xenophon, *Œconómicus* xii. 5, required of the slave, who is steward, the master owes no less to his slave's interests and person. In the *Epistle to the Colossians*, St. Paul has expressed it as the provision of what is just and equitable. He now bids the masters give up the threatening, that is, the well-known threatening. The verb *aniēmi*, rendered as "giving up," means "letting go" in *Heb.* xiii. 5, and "loosing" in *Acts* xvi. 26, xxvii. 40.

As to the participial clause,

Eph. vi. 9c. Knowing that the Lord, both theirs and yours,
Is in [the] heavens,

many commentators, following Wetstein, have illustrated it by the contemporary lines of the *Thyestes*, ascribed to Seneca or to Seneca's father, Seneca the reciter.

607. You—to whom the Ruler of sea and land
Has given the great right over death and life—
Lay aside swollen and puffed up looks.
What your inferior greatly dreads from you—
With this your superior Lord threatens you.

The Apostle adds,

Eph. vi. 9e. And there is no partiality
With Him.

The word, *prōsōpō-lemḡsia*, is derived from *prōsōpōn*, "a face," and *lēlēptai*, "it has been received," the perfect passive of *lambánō*, "I receive." In the Greek Vulgate, it simply means "showing favour." In the Greek Testament, where it is found in *James* ii. 1, *Romans* ii. 11, *Col.* iii. 25, and *Eph.* vi. 9, it implies partiality on account of external considerations.

This passage in the *Epistle to the Ephesians* is being dictated by St. Paul in the spring of 61 A.D. Two years hence, in the spring of 63 A.D., St. Peter will show that he has studied it. Writing his first epistle, he will address the household servants.

1 Pet. ii. 18. Domestics, [be] subordinating yourselves
With every [form of] fear to the masters,

Not only to the good and equitable,
But also to the perverse.

19. For this is [a cause of] a grace [or favour with God],
If—on account of [his] consciousness of God—

Anyone supports griefs,
Suffering unjustly.

20. For what kind of repute [have you with God],
If, sinning and being cuffed, you are enduring ?

But if, doing good and suffering, you are enduring,
This is a grace [or cause of favour] with God [that
is, He being judge].

21. For you were called to this,
Because Christ also suffered on behalf of you,

Leaving you a copy [to be traced over],
In order that you should closely-follow His traces.

Then St. Peter proceeds to unfold in some measure what that copy-line contained of infinite patience and loving redemption.

Two years later again, in the spring of 65, St. Paul will deal with another problem, connected with slavery. The question will arise, when a slave, privileged by his Christian position, but still a slave at heart and in the world, becomes insolent, insolence being then and ever a servile assumption of dignity. So, writing to St. Timothy at Ephesus, the Apostle will say,

- 1 Tim. vi. 1. As many as are under a yoke [as] slaves—
Let them regard their own masters [as] worthy of
every honour,

In order lest the name of God
And [lest] the teaching be blasphemed.

2. But they who have faithful [Christians as] masters
Let them not be despising [them],
Because they are brothers,

But rather let them be slaving,
Because [those persons] are faithful and beloved—
[Those] who are partaking [of the results] of the
well-doing [by the slave].

We may draw this section to a close with a quotation from the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. There has been much discussion as to the date of the tract. For the moment, we need only note that it was used by Hermas, whom we date under the papacy of St. Clement, 91-100 A.D. We conclude from this and its contents, that it was written between the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 and the year 90. In it we read,

- iv. 10. Thou shalt not command thy slave or slave-girl—
Who are hoping in the same God—in thy bitterness,
Lest haply they shall not fear the God over [you] both,

For He does not come to call [men] according to outward appearance,

But [He comes] upon those, whom the Spirit prepared.

11. But you, slaves, be subordinating yourselves to your lords—

As to a figure of God—in shame and fear.

Eph. vi. 10-17. The Resistance of the Christian Warrior.

St. Paul passes from the picture of serfdom to that of war in the heavenlies. It is like passing from the slavery of Egypt to the war with the Canaanites in the Holy Land. It was indeed inevitable that the Apostle, whose deep spiritual experiences never eclipsed his outlook, or paralysed his power of action, should have regard to the larger platform of Christian life, and cross the limit of the family circle to provide for the cosmic war. His very standpoint requires it. He sees the whole creation focussed in One, who is both Creator and Creature. The Messiah holds, enfolds and upholds all things. And the Universe is found one in obedience to Him more surely than its physical province is found one in obedience to the law of gravity. As the Messiah is the mediator between the Invisible God and the Universe, so the Church is the means of light, revelation and example to the Universe. As Bride and Temple and Body, she is set in the heavenlies. For a moment, there is discord in the universal order. And what St. Paul is sketching now in figures of speech, St. John will thirty-four years hence, in 95 A.D., unfold in the wonderful symbols of his *Apocalypse* xii. Between the supernatural order of God and the order of nature, is the preter-natural order of angelic life. There is the original source of the disorder in the cosmos. That source is not an evil power on an equality with God ; nor is it a created evil. It is a

matter of defective aim and perverted will. Allowed the free exercise of their will to God's greater glory and their own merit, some turned from God. Many are the figures under which Jewish Apocalyptic and the popular tales of all ages have bodied forth that crisis in the invisible world. But apart from all such play of the imagination, our own human intelligence can detect superhuman intelligence in the methods and arrangements of moral evil.

Three questions arise in connection with that evil. The first has regard to its place. If we picture that at all, we must picture it in space and time, because all our pictures are so framed, and because we cannot describe evil as dwelling in the Beatific Vision or as active in the order of the Divine Life. Nor can we limit it to earth. So in this encyclical, St. Paul speaks of it as active in "the heavenlies," *Eph.* vi. 12. He uses that expression five times in this epistle i. 3, 20, ii. 6, iii. 10, vi. 12. Now the word *ep-ouránios*, "heavenly," is used by Homer, *Odyssey* xvii. 484, *Iliad* vi. 129, 131, 527, by Pindar, *Fr.* 974, and by Plato, *Phaedrus* 256D. 3 *Maccabees* applies the adjective to God twice, vi. 28, vii. 6; and St. Paul employs it of God's eternal kingdom, 2 *Tim.* iv. 18. But the present encyclical is characterised by it in the neuter plural with the article, *tà ep-ouránia*, "the heavenlies." This is used of celestial phenomena by Plato in the *Apology* 19B. And the difference between the temporal sphere of the stars and the eternal sphere of the Church will measure the difference between Plato's meaning and St. Paul's. It is misleading, therefore, to connect the expression with "the birds of the heaven" in *Matt.* vi. 26, for the word "heaven" in that phrase is clearly used for the sky. It is also a mistake to identify it with "the air" of *Eph.* ii. 2; as that figure of speech suggests Satan's nearness to the earth, and his influence over those, who dwell on it. But our Lord and

the Church are in the heavenlies, *Eph.* i. 20, ii. 6 ; and none would think of describing either as in the air.

The second question has regard to the form of that evil. Being the malice of intelligent beings, it presents itself as organised, as a kingdom. So organised against God, it is the kingdom of the Satan, " the Adversary," that name being given to its chief. Now the human forces on this planet, so far as they are organised with other aims than God's glory and man's eternal good, are spoken of as the " kingdoms of the world," *Matt.* iv. 8, or " the kingdom of the world," *Apoc.* xi. 15. Since the word *kósmos*, " world," is used in these cases for men, so united in aim and work, the legions, *Mk.* v., 15, *Luke* viii. 30, of preternatural directors, or perverted angels, will be described by St. Paul, *Eph.* vi. 12, as *kōsmō-krātōres*, " cosmocrats " or " world-rulers," a very different name from God's title of *Pantócrātōr*, " Pantocrat," " all-ruler," or ruler of all, *2 Cor.* vi. 18, *Apoc.* i. 8, iv. 8, xi. 17, xv. 3, xvi. 7, 14, xix. 6, 15, xxi. 22. In this respect, Satan is described by our Lord as the *archōn* or prince of the world, *John* xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11, and by St. Paul as " the god of this age," *2 Cor.* iv. 4.

The last expression, " the god of this age," raises our third question. This has regard to the dualism of St. Paul, of which so much is said at the present time. Dualism is not tolerable to the philosopher, who sets out to understand the Universe as a whole. To purchase unity, he too often pays the price by eliminating elements in that whole. Sometimes, he will present evil, whether it be metaphysical imperfection or moral perverseness or physical pain, as a form of good. Sometimes, he will explain the finite as infinite, and the created as eternal. At one time, he will tell us that will and sensation are forms of thought ; at another time, that thought and sensation are forms of will ; and at yet another time, that thought and will are

only sensation. At one time, he will reduce matter to sensation ; at another time, sensation to a secretion ; and at yet another time, both matter and sensation to some third thing, pictured as a stream of change or as a perpetual mirror, that creates its own images. Finally, he achieves an abstract unity ; and that is worth as much to a serious thinker as the abstract number one to one hungry man, anxious to buy one piece of bread with one penny.

Indeed, a full view discloses, not dualisms, but problems of triple relations. As the mathematician cannot calculate the relations of three moving bodies, so the philosopher finds himself fretted by three active elements. If it is a question of God, the world and the soul, he will dissolve the world in God or the soul, and then attain a temporary satisfaction by dissolving the soul in God, or God in the soul. But such occupations stand to real philosophy as the game of draughts to the game of chess.

Because St. Paul acknowledged the existing power of evil in the world, and recognised it as organised, it is said that his view was dualistic. Further, as he distinguished between this age, in which that evil is evident, *2 Cor.* iv. 4, and the age to come, when that evil will become powerless, it is argued that he borrowed his dualistic view from Jewish Apocalypses. Now it must be said at once that the *Book of Jubilees*, written by Pharisees about 10 A.D., the *Assumption of Moses*, written at the same time and possibly as its conclusion, and the sections of the Pharisaic *Apocalypse of Baruch*, which were written before the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., do not distinguish two epochs. As to the saying of *Fourth Esdras* vii. 50, that the Most High has made not one age but two, we must remember that the book was written under Domitian, about the time of St. John's *Apocalypse*, 95 A.D. As to Slavonic *Enoch* lviii. 4, lxi. 2, Dalman points out in his *Words of Jesus* p. 150,

that the text is uncertain. The phrase, "the future age," occurs but once in Ethiopic *Enoch* lxxi. 15; and even there, we find a variant reading, "the future peace." So it is quite unreasonable to suppose that St. Paul owed the distinction between this age and the future to Jewish Apocalypses.

As a matter of fact, the distinction is involved in his fundamental thesis. All things must be subordinated to the Christ; but at the moment, we see the harmony of the universal order troubled by perverted wills. The possibility of such perversion was necessarily involved in the gift of free-will. That gift is a means to God's greater glory in the voluntary homage of those who possess it, and to their own merit by its due exercise. As to its abuse by perverted wills, that cannot be allowed to mar the universal harmony eternally. The age will come, when everything will be subordinated to the Christ. Then the hour of choice will be over. The freedom of earth's wayfarer, like his faith, will cease for even the Blessed in Heaven, as the Vision of God will make it impossible for them to surrender their enraptured love of Him to any creature. For those sacred ones, faith will be transformed to knowledge; and the intellect will be filled with the Highest Truth by that grace, which we call the Light of Glory. The free will becomes more than free will, as free will confirmed in good; and the will is deified by most intimate union with the Highest Good. Then God's eternal Will is done, and His cosmic kingdom come. St. Thomas, *Summa* pt. 1. q. xix. 10, pt. 2. div. 1, q. iv. 4, pt. 3, q. xviii. 4.

Now St. Paul looks out beyond the family circle to the cosmic scene. St. Jerome says truly that a general injunction now follows special ones; for the picture is representative of every Christian, and not only of those who are

wives or children or slaves or heads of families. He had written to the Corinthians in the autumn of 55 A.D.,

1 Cor. xvi. 13. Be you watching :
 Be you standing in the faith.
 Be you behaving like a man,
 Be you being made mighty.

Now he writes,

Eph. vi. 10. For the rest [of the necessary precepts]—
 Be being empowered in [the] Lord,
 And in the might of His strength.

We have already, in *Eph.* i. 19, found "power" and "might" and "strength," each with its own implication. But here the three are brought together with a cumulative effect. The source of power is, of course, our Lord, *John* xv. 5, apart from whom we have no power to do anything.

We have rendered the opening phrase, "for the rest," and applied it to the precepts. In our Greek Text, we read *τοῦ λοιποῦ*. This, it may easily be argued, was Origen's reading, preserved in Cramer's *Caténæ*, on this passage. Now Origen set up his school in Palestinian Caesarea in 231. A century later, in 331, and in the same library, we may place the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B with the same reading. With these, are the Alexandrian A, of the early fifth century, and the contemporary treatise *on Adoration*, written by the Alexandrian Cyril between 417 and 428, as well as the Alexandrian Euthalius in 458, represented by a manuscript of 1301, and the sophist Procopius, who flourished at Gaza about 520, and is quoted by a patriarch of Constantinople, Nicephorus, ii. 62, about 806. The Damascene, between 717 and 741, is on the same side.

Now *τοῦ λοιποῦ* strictly means "for the rest [of time],"

“in the time to come,” “henceforth,” *Gal.* vi. 17. In the present place, it means “for the rest [of the matter],” “finally.” This is evident from the context. It is also suggested by 1 *Thess.* iv. 1, 2 *Thess.* iii. 1, 2 *Cor.* xiii. 11, and *Phil.* iii. 1, where St. Paul uses *loipón*, with or without the article, in a similar position. But we must confess that *loipón* may mean “for the rest [of the time]” as well as “for the rest [of the matter].”

Because the Apostle uses the form *loipón* in so many places, the *loipoû* of *Eph.* vi. 10, has been assimilated to it by changing the *u* into *n*. This change first appears in St. Chrysostom, before 398 A.D. From him, it was borrowed by the Syrian Theodoret about 423, by the Thessalian Œcumenius about 600, and by Theophylact in Bulgaria about 1077. It is found as a Syrian reading in the second corrector of the Sinaitic Aleph, in Cent. vii., and in the three ninth century uncials, the Moscovian K, the Angelic L and the Porphyrian P. It had passed into the Western Text in the sixth century through Claromontanus D, from which it was directly copied in the Sangerman E, in Cent. ix. In the same ninth century, it appeared in the twin uncials, the Augien F and the Boernerian G, most probably made in Italy.

The verb, which we have rendered “be being empowered,” in order to express the force of the present imperative, is used in the same passive sense in *Acts* ix. 22, *Rom.* iv. 20, *Heb.* xi. 34, and 2 *Tim.* ii. 1. It means, of course, to be strengthened. But we have translated it “empowered” to preserve its connection with *dúnāmis*, “power,” and the distinction between “power,” “might,” and “strength.”

Now the Apostle bids the Christian put on his full armour. As in 2 *Macc.* iii. 25, xi. 8, and *Luke* xi. 22, it is *pan-ōplia*, the Latin *armatura*, the “complete armour,” as distinguished from *hōpla* in 2 *Cor.* x. 4, the Latin *arma*,

“ arms.” Writing to the Roman Christians about January 57, he more than hinted the full meaning of the figure, when to the exhortation,

Rom. xiii. 12. But let us invest ourselves in the arms of the light,
he added the command,

Rom. xiii. 14. But invest yourselves in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Now in the present passage he says,

Eph. vi. 11. Invest yourselves in the panoply of God,
Towards the [end] that you may be able
to stand
[With a sentinel gaze] towards the plans
of the Devil.

We have already found the word *mēthōdia*, “ plan,” in the only other place in which it occurs, *Eph.* iv. 14. Here, as there, it is used in a bad sense. The noun may have been coined by St. Paul ; but the verb is used by the Greek Vulgate, 2 *Sam.* xix. 27, with the bad meaning of dealing craftily.

Before passing to the next verses, it may be worth while to read St. Peter’s paraphrase of those, which we have just examined. Two years hence, in the spring of 63, he will write,

1 Pet. v. 8. Be sober,
Be watchful.

Your opponent, [the] Devil,—
As a lion, roaring—[Ps. xxii. 14]

Walks about,
Seeking whom to devour.

Whom do you withstand,
Firm [with regard] to the faith.

St. Paul now points out the lines of the hostile army, and tells the nature of the battle. The word *pālē* is indeed used for "struggle," by Æschylus in his *Choéphoræ* 866, in 458 B.C., and by Euripides in his *Heraclidae* 159, about 421 B.C. But its ordinary meaning is "wrestling," as here, in Homer's *Odyssey* viii. 206, between 950 and 900 B.C., in the *Alceſtis* 1031, of Euripides, performed in 438 B.C., and in Plato's *Laws* 795, 796, written a little before 348 B.C.

So for a moment, St. Paul, blending his metaphors, passes from the picture of the heavy-armed soldier to that of the wrestler in the arena, and says,

Eph. vi. 12. Because to us, the wrestling is not
Against blood and flesh,

But against the principedoms,
Against the authorities,

Against the world-rulers of this darkness,
Against the spiritual [hosts] of evil in the
heavenlies.

The phrase "blood and flesh," as here and in *Heb.* ii. 14, or "flesh and blood," as in *Sirach*, xiv. 18, xvii. 31, *Gal.* i. 16, 1 *Cor.* xv. 50, and *Matt.* xvi. 17, does not, though St. Jerome suggests it, imply a man's lower nature, for "blood" would not be added in such a case. But it is a common expression in Rabbinic literature for men. It is found in Jewish Apocalyptic, in a portion of Ethiopic *Enoch* xv. 4, written a little before 170 B.C. There it refers to men and to the children of those fallen angels, who were said to have married daughters of men. In the first treatise of the Talmud, that on *Bērākhôth*, or "Blessings," the Gemara, or commentary, 28b, which was compiled sometime between 180 and 500 A.D., contrasts "a king of flesh and blood"

with " the King of kings," and " the fear of flesh and blood " with " the fear of heaven."

In *Eph.* i. 21, St. Paul used the phrase " every principedom and authority " of unfallen angels. And in *Eph.* iii. 10, " the principedoms and the authorities " must be understood in the same sense. But in the present passage, the words are applied to classes of fallen angels. As ruling the cosmos, that word being understood of the world as organised on other lines than God's will and glory, they are each given the name of *kōsmō-krātōr*, " cosmo-crat," " world-ruler," or " ruler of the world," as God is named *Pantō-krātōr*, " Panto-crat," " all-ruler " or " ruler of everything," in 2 *Cor.* vi. 18, *Apoc.* i. 8, and other passages. The word, *kōsmō-krātōr*, is found in the scholiast's note on the *Clouds* of Aristophanes, line 397. Valentinus, the Alexandrian Jew, who carried his Gnosticism to Rome in the year 140 A.D., spoke of the Devil by this name, according to the work of St. Irenaeus *Against Heresies* I. v. 4, written between 182 and 188 A.D. The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, " Testament of Solomon," though the work originated between 109 and 105 B.C., evidently owes its demons' speech,

" We are those, who are called elements [stoicheia],

" The world-rulers of this world,"

to a Christian interpolator, who based the first line wrongly enough on *Col.* ii. 20, and the second on our passage, *Eph.* vi. 12. The word is also found in the *Orphic Hymns*, but these, as extant, appear to have been produced at Alexandria in the Christian era. At a later time, Jewish authors took up the word, wrote it in Hebrew letters, and applied it in the *Bērēshith Rabbah* 57, an exegetical Midrash, or collection of homilies, on *Genesis*, to the four kings, defeated by Abraham. That treatise, we should note, was

originally a Palestinian composition of our third century. The word is applied to the Angel of death in *Wayyikra Rabbah*, a Palestinian Midrash on *Leviticus*, compiled in the middle of the seventh century. At a still later time, it is given in *Shir Rabbah*, a Midrash on *Canticles*, to Nebuchadnezzar, Evil-Merodach and Belshazzar. It is necessary to note the periods in which the authors wrote, as otherwise the reader may be misled to suppose that St. Paul borrowed a word or expression from those, who were really indebted directly or indirectly to him.

The next line is literally,

Eph. vi. 12f. Against the spiritual [things] of the evil in the
heavenlies.

But we omit the article before "evil," lest the English rendering should suggest an evil, which is only in the heavenlies. And we insert the word "hosts" to complete the meaning of the word "spiritual." Those hosts are indeed "the spirituals of the evil," or "the evil spirits." As they are intelligent beings, it might mislead, were we to use the ambiguous word, "forces," instead of the word "hosts." Abbott prefers "forces," and argues that the Greek word *pneumatikōn* means what relates to "the spirit," not to "spirits." We suggest that he allows the derivation too much influence in determining the meaning, which must also and especially be defined by the use, according to the Horatian rule, *Art of Poetry* 71, 72.

Having pointed to the enemy, the Apostle adds,

Eph. vi. 13. On account of this, take up the panoply of
God,

In order that you may be able to withstand
in the day, the evil [day].

And when you have worked out all things,
to stand.

It has been supposed that "take up" was an ancient drill-word in connection with panoplies. At all events, the *Book of Judith*, xiv. 3, and Josephus, in his *Antiquities* IV. v. 2, XX. v. 3, of 93 A.D., use the expression, "taking up the panoplies." And we may recall that Vergil, viii. 608, between 30 and 19 B.C., pictured Æneas as receiving from his mother Venus the helmet, sword, breastplate, greaves, spear and shield, wrought for him by Vulcan and the Cyclopes of Etna.

In the Sermon on the Mount, our Lord forbade resistance to the assaults of evil, saying,

Matt. v. 39. But I say to you,
Not to withstand the evil [one].

It will be noted that we render the Greek as "the evil [one]," as in the Lord's Prayer, *Matt.* vi. 13. But there is clearly a great difference between the reference in our Lord's prohibition, and that in St. Paul's command. The former deals with physical persecutions, and the latter with moral temptations. Both are at hand. Three years more will see the outbreak of the Neronian frenzy. And the Flavian persecution of the Christian name itself will culminate in Domitian's persecution of 95 A.D. Then, it will be happy for the victims, having actively resisted every inducement to apostasy, and so having "worked out" all things, "working out" their own salvation, *Phil.* ii. 12, to hold their ground, and wait like Israel, hemmed in by sea, mountain, desert and foe, for the full salvation of God, *Exodus* xiv. 13. We find such deliverance suggested in the form of the expression, "in the day, the evil [day]." This does not merely recall the clause in

Eph. v. 16b, Because the days are evil.

It is a quotation from

Ps. xli. 1. The Lord will deliver him in the day of evil,

that is, in the evil day, the time of adversity.

So the evil day is not confined to the Neronian outbreak, the Domitian oppression, or the final apostasy. At any such time, the Christian must "work out" all things. This verb, employed twenty-one times by St. Paul, implies difficulty overcome and work achieved. In the grand figure here, he uses it to present the Christian as having done all that was possible, and as now standing absolutely at bay. The very attitude, significant of supreme heroism, enthralls men. Bunyan, indeed, in his *Pilgrim's Progress*, has caught its spirit. Ibsen, too, in his *Brand*, portrays one who is utterly uncompromising with regard to principle. At the end of the intense and racking fourth act, his hero, completely bereaved and utterly alone against the world, cries with a broken heart,

Soul, be faithful till the last,
Knowing that your loss of all
Wins for ever all you cast
Seemingly beyond recall.

We pass on with St. Paul to the description of the Christian's armour. There were two sources for his imagery, the scroll of *Isaiah* and the figure of the Roman soldier beside him. In *Isaiah*, it had been said of the Messiah, the Christ,

Is. xi. 4. And He will smite earth with the club of His mouth ;
And He will slay a wicked one with the breath of His
lips.

5. And justice will be the girdle of His flanks ;
And faithfulness, the girdle of His hips.

The breath of Messiah's lips, the word of God, will suggest the sword by its power to slay. The girdle will represent faithfulness, fidelity to promises, moral truth. St. Paul had also read of Jehovah in

Is. lix. 17. And He invested Himself with justice as a breastplate ;
And a helmet of salvation [was] upon His head.

And He invested Himself with garments of vengeance
as vestment ;
And He wrapped Himself in zeal as a tunic.

So Isaiah suggested moral meanings for a soldier's armour ; and men were not slow to adopt his suggestion. Therefore, it is said of the Lord in

Wisd. v. 17. He will take His zeal to Himself as a panoply ;
And He will make the creation arms [or weapons]
for vengeance on enemies.

18. He will invest Himself in justice as a breastplate
And He will encircle Himself with unfeigned judgement as a helmet.

19. He will take piety as an invincible [round] buckler ;
And He will sharpen His abrupt wrath for a sword.

Then St. Paul, writing to the Thessalonian Christians about May, 52 A.D., appeals to them,

1 Thess. v. 8. Since we invested ourselves in a breastplate of
faith and love ;
And in a hope of salvation as a helmet.

Later still, in 115 A.D., St. Ignatius of Antioch will write to St. Polycarp,

vi. Let your baptism remain as [a soldier's] arms,
Faith as a helmet,
Love as a spear,
Endurance as a panoply.

But in the present passage, St. Paul does more than adopt the suggestion, for he works out the figure fully. We, for our part, may gather from the passage in Vergil's *Æneid*, viii. 620-625, to which we have already referred, or from the earlier passage in *Polybius* vi. 23, written between 146 and 122 B.C., that a heavy-armed Roman soldier's accoutrements consisted of helmet, breastplate, shield, sword, spear and greaves. The last two are omitted by St. Paul, probably because the man beside him was not carrying his spear, and because it was enough in regard to the lower extremities to mention the sandalling.

By this time, St. Paul was sufficiently acquainted with the apparel of a Roman soldier. This man, to whom he was chained, wore a woollen shirt, *chitōn* in Greek, *túnica* in Latin, reaching to the knees and without sleeves. Over this was a leather belt, *zōnē* in Greek, *mitra* in Greek and Latin. This was stuffed with wool, and faced with a bronze plate to protect the lower part of the body. Then the soldier put on his breastplate, *thōrāx* in Greek, and *lōrica* in Latin. This consisted of two bronze or iron plates, one for the breast, the other for the back, and both connected by buckles. Or it was made of leather thongs, faced with metal, and conjoined in horizontal parallels. In the former case, the soldier now added a second belt, fastened by buckles. To each foot was bound a simple sole, the Greek *hupō-dēma*, the Latin *sōlea*. This lacked the leather covering for the toes, which was characteristic of women's sandals. Or the soldier may have worn a soldier's boot, the Latin *cáliga*, a heavy boot with large nails. His shins were protected by greaves, the Greek *knēmīs*, the Latin *ócrea*. These were worn like a cricketer's pads. They were made of leather, or of metal on leather, and were fastened with buckles and ankle-rings.

Under the Empire, the standard-bearers wore a leather

cap, this being a reversion to the original form of helmet. But St. Paul's attendant would not have that privilege. From his girdle, or from a shoulder-strap round his neck, hung his short, sharp, two-edged sword. This was at his right hand, because of his shield at his left. As the officers did not carry a shield, they wore their sword at their left side. For shield, the soldier had, not the round buckler, the Greek *aspis*, the Latin *clipeus*, to which the *Book of Wisdom* v. 19, has just drawn our attention, but the oblong shield, the Greek *thürēōs*, the Latin *scutum*. This was intended to cover the whole body, and was therefore, according to Polybius, four feet long by nearly a yard wide. It was shaped like a vertical section of a cylinder, and was made of boards in two layers, glued together, covered with leather, and strengthened at both ends with iron, an iron boss also being set in it.

Taking, then, the soldier beside him for the basis of his metaphor, St. Paul says,

- Eph. vi. 14. Stand, therefore, [having] girdled your hip
with truth,
And [having] invested yourselves with the
breastplate of [or, that is] justice,
15. And [having] sandalled yourselves as to the
feet
In readiness [for the preaching] of the Gospel
of peace.

The word for "readiness" is used in the Greek Vulgate as meaning "a base," to represent the Hebrew *mākhôn*. But it is also used there in the sense of "preparation," for example, in *Psalms* x. 17, lxxv. 9, *Nahum* ii. 3, these passages being numbered according to the Hebrew reckoning, and in *Wisdom* xiii. 12. The noun is found

only here in the Greek Testament. But St. Paul uses the verb in 1 *Cor.* ii. 9, *Philem.* 22, and 2 *Tim.* ii. 21, for "make ready." The noun *hētōimāsía*, like its Attic equivalent *hētōimōtēs*, then means "a being prepared," "readiness," and in the present case, a readiness to announce peace.

It has been suggested that this passage is reminiscent of the Israelite at the first passover, *Exodus* xii. 11, but no connection can be established. There is, however, a reference to

Is. lii. 7. How beautiful on the mountains
The feet of him, who brings good tidings,
Proclaiming peace!—

those words being repeated in *Nahum* ii. 1 (Heb.). Further, our present line, *Eph.* vi. 15b, recalls *Eph.* ii. 17, which told us how our Lord made peace, and proclaimed it to Jews and Gentiles. The same peace with God, His own supernatural gift to us, will again be associated with war and militarism, when St. Paul, in a few months, will write to the Philippians, saying,

Phil. iv. 7. And the peace of God—
Which is surpassing every intelligence—

Will garrison your hearts
And your thoughts in Christ Jesus.

That peace within is an earnest of victory; and the soldier, engaged in the battle without, is already prepared to announce the peace, which will follow there.

The next verse will incidentally tell us of the enemies' weapons. These are *ta bēlē*, "the bolts," "things thrown," "the darts, which have been set on fire." Apollodorus of Athens used this expression about 140 B.C., in his *Bibliotheca* ii. 5. The things were well-known. Herodotus,

viii. 52, about 445 B.C., tells us that the Persians under Xerxes, during their assault upon Athens in 480 B.C., wrapped tow round their arrows and set fire to it. Thucydides, ii. 75, who died in 411 B.C., 1 *Maccabees* vi. 51, written between 105 and 63 B.C., and Livy, xxi. 8, who published his work between 14 and 17 A.D., mention missiles similarly prepared. These developed into the *malléolus*, or "little hammer," which contained pitch and tow in its transverse head. And very happily, they serve as symbols for Satan's assaults and temptations.

"Fiery darts" were resisted by means of leather hides, *Thucydides* ii. 75, in which they became fixed and extinguished. So the Apostle continues,

Eph. vi. 16. In [addition to] all [these] things, [having]
 taken up the shield of [or, that is] faith,
 In which you will be able to quench all the
 darts of the Evil [one],
 Which [darts] have been set on fire.

"The shield of faith" means "the shield, that is, faith," as "the breastplate of justice" meant "the breastplate, that is, justice," the genitive being one of apposition.

In 1 *Thess.* v. 8, St. Paul explained the helmet as the hope of salvation. Now, nine years later, he makes it a symbol of salvation itself. The change, however, is not due to the difference of time, but to that of the aspect, in which the Christian is regarded. Now such a one is seen seated in the heavenlies, *Eph.* ii. 6, or as battling there, *Eph.* vi. 12. Therefore, the Apostle says,

Eph. vi. 17. And accept [from God] the helmet of [or,
 that is] salvation,
 And the sword of the Spirit,
 Which [thing] is an utterance of God.

The word for "salvation" is a neuter form, and does not occur elsewhere in St. Paul's epistles. But here, as in *Luke* ii. 30, iii. 6, and *Acts* xxviii. 28, it is derived from the Greek Vulgate. The phrase "the word of God," or more literally, "an utterance of God," is parallel to "the sword of the Spirit," and explains it. The neuter form of the relative, "which," referring to the feminine word for "sword," is to be explained by the attraction of the pronoun into the same gender as the neuter word for "utterance." It will be noted that the helmet is accepted from God, and that the word is God's. Both the defensive and the offensive arms in this verse are therefore derived from God.

As to the presentation of God's Word under the form of a sword, it will be remembered that there is a similar figure in

Heb. iv. 12. For the Word of God [is] living and active
And cutting-more-sharply than any two-edged
sword ;

and in *Hosea* vi. 5, *Isaiah* xi. 4, xlix. 2, *Apoc.* i. 16, ii. 12, xix. 15, and in the Jewish proverb that "he who utters the Shema [*Deut.* vi. 4-9, xi. 13-21, *Num.* xv. 37-41] is as if he held a two-edged sword." Pagan writers had compared human speech to a two-edged sword, as Euripides had done in his *Hélène* 983, of 425 B.C. And Phocylides of Milétus, who was born about 540 B.C., says in one of his lines, 118, unless indeed the poem be the composition of a Jewish Christian at Alexandria, that "a word is a man's weapon, sharper than iron," Grace takes the very natural metaphor to use it of Divine utterance. And everyone will recall our Lord's use of the weapon, when He met the three temptations with words from *Deuteronomy* viii. 3, vi. 13, 16.

Eph. vi. 16. Disputed Readings, "in," "the."

In verse 16, we rendered the opening phrase, "In [addition to] all [these] things." We read the preposition as *en*, "in," not *epi*. No doubt, the meaning in any case is "in addition to all," though the Latin versions distinguish the *en* as "in" from *epi* as *super*, "over." When we look back to *Luke* xvi. 26, we find the very same variation among the manuscripts. In both places, the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B present *en*, the Alexandrian A and the Claromontanus D presenting *epi*. When we consider the classes of text represented, we note that the quarrel is a pretty one.

First of all, it is necessary to omit Cramer's *Caténæ* of 1842, for its comment on the text represents St. Chrysostom as using *en*, though he undoubtedly, p. 205, iv. 26, used *epi*. Then we must regard Methodius of Tyre, about 290, as in favour of *en*, according to Epiphanius p. 586, about 368, and in spite of Photius, about 858, followed in the editions of Jahn p. 89, and Gallandius iii. 787. The African Vigilus of Thapsus, consecrated about 484, must be reckoned on the same side, as he has *in omnibus* in his work, against the Arian Varimadus, iii, 24, if indeed he really wrote that treatise which is professedly by Idacius Clarus. *De Trinitate* xii., has *super*, p. 313 of Chifflet's edition, and has been ascribed to Vigilus; but it is probably a translation of a tract by St. Athanasius.

Now we may regard "in" as the Old Latin reading. It is found in St. Cyprian, p. 329, consecrated for Carthage about 248 A.D., in Victorinus at Rome about 360, in Lucifer of Cagliari, p. 249, who died in 371, in St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate of 385, in Claromontanus d, of Cent. vi., in its ninth century copy, the Sangerman e, and in the twin manuscripts of the same ninth century, the Augien f and

the Boernerian *g*, as well as in the *Speculum*, or "Mirror," p. 95, of Cent. viii. or ix. According to custom, we indicate the Greek uncials by capital letters, and use small letters for the accompanying Latin versions.

The word "in" is supported by St. Cyril of Jerusalem, p. 73, whose *Catechetical Lectures* may be dated about 346 A.D., and by St. Gregory the Nazianzene, consecrated in 370. These lead us to seek the eastern witnesses. Alexandria and Palestinian Caesarea support "in" by the Bohairic version, made for northern Egypt about 200 or 250, by the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, probably of Caesarea and the year 331, by the Porphyrian P, of Cent. ix., and the cursive 17, of Cent. ix. or x.

The Syrian evidence for "in" is represented by the Harclean Syriac of 616, and the cursives, 31 and 80, of Cent. xi., 34 and 118, of Cent. xii., 26, of cent. xiii., 213, of Cent. xiv., and 37, of Cent. xv. To these we may add the Ethiopic version, badly made about 600.

On the other hand, St. Jerome witnesses to *epi*, translated as *super*, "over," in his commentary on this epistle in 388. He was, however, profoundly influenced in that work by Origen; and it would appear that Origen read *epi*, because he is so represented by his Latin interpreter, Rufinus ii. 477, in 398 A.D. Then, that preposition is supported by the well-defined group, which includes St. Chrysostom p. 205 and iv. 26, before 398, the Syrian Theodoret, about 423, the monk Antiochus p. 1211, about 614, and the Damascene, both in his comment on the verse and in his *Parallels* 610, between 717 and 741. With regard to the present passage and the reading *epi*, the Gothic version, made after 341, Ephraem the Syrian, iii. 335, who died in 373, the Armenian version, made after 431, and the Schaafian edition in 1708 of the Syriac Peshittā or Vulgate, may be included among those Syrian witnesses. So far,

we may say that *epi* is supported by Origen and the Syrian Text ; and we may regard Origen's reading as carried on by the Alexandrian Cyril's *Adoration* p. 108, and *Abacuc* p. 776, written between 417 and 428, and by the Alexandrian Euthalius in 458, according to the manuscript of 1301. To the Syrian witnesses, we must add the ninth century uncials, the Moscovian K and the Angelic L, together with the cursive 47, of Cent. xi.

Origen and the Syrian Text are supported by the Alexandrian uncial A of the early fifth century. The same reading is found in Claromontanus D, which was made in Cent. vi., and probably in Egypt. Thence it passed into the Sangerman E, copied from D in Cent. ix. It is found also in the twin uncials, made in Italy in Cent. ix., the Augien F and the Boernerian G. And very strange to say, it appears in Ambrosiaster at Rome under Pope Dámasus, 366-384.

Polybius, who died in 122 B.C., had used *epi* in his passage on a soldier's arms, vi. 23. We suggest that this may be the source of the variant reading. But whatever hypothesis may be ultimately established as a satisfactory theory of origin and history, we confess that our own decision in favour of "in" is mainly due to the fact that the Bohairic, the Old Latin, the two Caesarean uncials and so many cursives are at one.

The second disputed reading is apparently a question of an article. In reality, it is more. We are presented with the problem of a strange alliance. We find the Vatican B, probably of Caesarea and the year 331, and representing the Neutral or Early Alexandrian Text, in agreement with the Western Text, found in the Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., and the twin uncials, the Augien F and the Boernerian G, both of Cent. ix. These are leagued in an alliance against the world to deny an article to the participle,

"[have] been set on fire," so that we should be compelled to render the expression, not as "the darts, which have been set on fire," but as "the darts, set on fire as they have been." However, this is not the moment for us to seek an explanation for the traces of the Western Text here and elsewhere in the Vatican uncial B.

The evidence in favour of the article is overwhelming. We can match the Vatican B by the Sinaitic Aleph, both being probably of Caesarea and the year 331, and partly by the same scribe. The Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., is outmatched by the Alexandrian A, of the early fifth century. The Augien F and Boernerian G, of Cent. ix., are overborne by five uncial witnesses of the same century, that is, the second corrector of the Claromontanus, D^o, the Sangerman E, the Moscovian K, the Angelic L, and the Porphyrian P, which we may supplement by the cursives 17, of Cent. ix. or x., 47, of Cent. xi., and 37, of Cent. xv.

Further, there is the evidence of Clement, p. 90, head of the Alexandrian School about 189; that of his successor in 203, Origen, according to Cramer's *Caténæ* vi. 221, and the Latin translation by Rufinus, ii. 126, iv. 406; that of the anti-Origenist, Methodius of Tyre, about 290, his testimony being preserved by Epiphanius of Salamis, about 368; that of the *Dialogue* against the Marcionites p. 816, written about 300, and wrongly attributed to Origen; that of the Jerusalem Cyril p. 73, about 346; that of the Syrian Ephraem, a deacon of Edessa, iii. 335, who died about 373; and that of his contemporary, Basil the Great, of Cappadocian Caesarea, who lived from 327 to 379. Returning to Alexandria, we find the same evidence given by St. Cyril, in his *Adoration* 105, and in his *Abacuc* 776, written between 417 and 428, and by Euthalius in 458, according to a palimpsest of 1301.

Eph. vi. 18-20. The Third Prayer.

Now the Apostle leaves the metaphor of the soldier, and spends the passion of his soul in a few intense and simple words. It would impose on the passage an artificial connection, never more out of place, were we to say that he inserts these words on prayer to take the place of the omitted *pilum*, the iron-headed and steel-pointed javelin of the Roman legionaries. And surely it would be wandering far afield, were we to seek an analogy between the self-surrender of the soul to God in prayer and the hurling of this weapon against an enemy's shield and armour, as the Roman soldier did at the beginning of an engagement, before the hand-to-hand encounter with the sword. Indeed such a supposition not only misses the change of metaphor, but also the motive of the change. We have, so to speak, been watching the soldier Joshua in his battle with Amalek at Rephidim. And now, we are called away to pray with Moses on the hill-top, *Exod. xvii. 8-13*.

St. Paul starts again from the word "stand," though he does not explicitly repeat it. He speaks of prayer under two terms, *prōseuchē*, "prayer," which is addressed to God on any theme, and *deēsis*, "supplication," which implies an entreating, a request, made to any one. So he dictates,

Eph. vi. 18. [Stand] by means of every [form] of prayer
and supplication,
Praying in every season in [the] Spirit,
And keeping awake unto it
In every [form of] perseverance and
supplication
Concerning all the holy [ones],
And on behalf of me—

“Prayer” and “supplication” will be found together again in the *Epistle to the Philippians*, to be written toward the end of this year, and in the *First Epistle to Timothy* v. 5, to be written four years hence in the spring of 65. To supplication, St. Paul adds a second special form of prayer, when he mentions “thanksgiving” in

Phil. iv. 6. But in all the prayer and the supplication with
thanksgiving,
Let your requests be being made known unto God.

He will add a third special form in “petitions,” when he will write,

1 Tim. ii. 1. I exhort [you], therefore, first of all things, to make
Supplications, prayers, petitions, thanksgivings,

- On behalf of all men,
2. On behalf of kings and all those who are in
superiority

As Origen indicates, the four words are in an ascending order. There is first of all the suppliant. Then there is the soul uplifted to God. Next there is the petitioner to God, as to His Emperor, the word *enteuxis*, “petition,” being used generally of requests made to the Roman Emperor, as in St. Justin Martyr’s *First Apology*, i., written in 150 A.D., when Felix was prefect of Alexandria, 1 *Apol.* xxix. And finally, there is the thanksgiving, that follows the granting of the petition.

The prayer is to be made in every season, that is, on every opportunity. It is also to be made “in [the] Spirit.” That does not mean “with the [human] spirit,” as in 1 *Cor.* xiv. 15, where St. Paul is urging men to pray with their intelligence as well as with their spirit. But the phrase carries us back to the *Epistle to the Romans*, written in

January 57, a little more than four years ago, when the Apostle said,

Rom. viii. 26. But the Spirit also in like manner
Co-helps our weakness ;

For as to what [that is, how] we should pray—
As we ought—we do not know.

But the Spirit Itself entreats-on-behalf-of [us]
With unutterable groanings.

But the prayer is to be continual, as it can be, since necessary attention to work need not interrupt the soul's communion with God. Indeed, it is often in our more difficult and exacting labours, we are most conscious of the Divine Presence, as the source to which we look for help. Therefore, the Apostle says that the prayer is to be made "in every season," or, as he said to the Thessalonians about May 52,

1 Thess. v. 17. Be you praying unintermittingly.

He urges wakefulness also and perseverance, using the verb *agr-upneîn*, from *agrĕō*, "I hunt after," and *hupnōs*, "sleep," to mean "being wakeful," as in *Mark* xiii. 33, *Luke* xxi. 36, and *Heb.* xiii. 17. And such an expression as

Eph. vi. 18c. And keeping awake unto it,
plainly means

And being intent upon it.

Writing to the Roman Christians, he had urged that they should be

Rom. xii. 12. Persevering in the prayer,

13. Being communicants in the needs of the holy [ones].

And now he urges the churches of Ephesus and the Lycus Valley to pray

Eph. vi. 18. In every [form of] perseverance and supplication

Concerning all the holy [ones],
And on behalf of me—

The Greek noun for “perseverance” is found in this passage alone; but the verb “to persevere” or “adhere firmly” is frequently met. The expression “in” or “by means of every [form of] perseverance,” shows that the words “in every [form of] perseverance and supplication” must be taken as a hendiadys, the two nouns representing an adjective and a noun. So we may render the line,

In every [form of] persevering supplication.

At this point, and before examining the object of the “Third Prayer,” we may consider the parallel passage in the epistle, which St. Paul has just written to the Colossians.

Col. iv. 2. Be persevering in the prayer,

Being watchful in it in thanksgiving,

3. Praying at the same time also concerning us,
In order that God may open to us a door of the Word,

To speak the Mystery of the Christ,—
On account of which I have also been bound—

4. In order that I may make it manifest,
As I ought [that is, am morally bound] to speak.

“A door of the Word” is evidently an opportunity for missionary work, as in 1 *Cor.* xvi. 9, 2 *Cor.* ii. 12, *Apoc.* iii. 8. But in *Eph.* vi. 19, the word in the opening of the mouth, like the opening of the lips in Ps. li. 17, is God’s gift of effective speech. And “the Mystery of the Christ,”

as regards the Universe, the Jews and Gentiles, and the Church, *Eph.* i. 9-14, is described as "the Mystery of the Gospel" in *Eph.* vi. 19.

We now turn to the third prayer, *Eph.* i. 17-19, being the first, and iii. 14-19, being the second. St. Paul asks his readers to pray,

Eph. vi. 19. In order that a word may be given to me
In opening of my mouth

To make known in boldness [of speech],
The mystery of the Gospel—

20. On behalf of which I am an ambassador
In a chain—

In order that I may be bold[-spoken] in it,
As I ought to speak.

The parallelism between the expression,

In order that a word may be given to me,

and the phrase,

In opening of my mouth,

confirms our interpretation of the latter as God's opening of the Apostle's mouth. It therefore implies God's gift of speech, and not merely St. Paul's opening of his own lips.

Earlier in his encyclical iii. 12, the Apostle spoke of boldness toward God. But now he is thinking of the boldness necessary to meet Nero, the hostile Jews, and the pagan Empire, which he would convert.

In the summer of 56, when he was a free man in Macedonia, he described himself as an ambassador on behalf of

Christ, and as a mouthpiece for God, 2 *Cor.* v. 20. Now, as in *Acts* xxviii. 20, and 2 *Tim.* i. 16, his sensitiveness to his position suggests, the instinct of the orator seizes, and the tenderness of that inspired soul adapts the very chain, which binds his right arm to the soldier's left, to win the prayers for which he appeals. So he connects two pictures, which seemed impossible of connection, that of an ambassador's inviolable person and that of a chain. At the same time, there is an implied contrast between "in boldness" and "in a chain."

Eph. vi. 21, 22. Tychicus.

The encyclical does mention one of St. Paul's friends. But Tychicus is the carrier of the letter, and needs some formal authorisation to approve him as the Apostle's messenger. Such a note had been inserted in the *Epistle to the Colossians*.

Col. iv. 7. The things relating to me—all things—
He will make known to you—Tychicus,

The loved brother and faithful minister
And co-bondman in [the] Lord,

8. Whom I [have] sent to you
[With a view] unto this very thing,

In order that he may know the things concerning you,
And may encourage your hearts—

9. With Onesimus,
The faithful and loved brother—
Who is from among you—

They will make known to you all things
As to the things here.

Tychicus will require a similar authorisation for the other

churches, Ephesus, Laodicea and Hierapolis. Therefore, St. Paul inserts this similar statement in the encyclical.

Eph. vi. 21. But in order that you may know—you also—
The things relating to me—how I do—all
things—

He will make known to you—Tychicus,
The loved brother and faithful minister in
[the] Lord,

22. Whom I [have] sent to you
[With a view] unto this very thing,

In order that you may know the things
concerning us,
And may encourage your hearts.

St. Paul inserts the words “you also” in the first line. It certainly means “you as well as others”; but who were the others? The Roman Christians around St. Paul knew his affairs. The commission to Tychicus has already been mentioned in the *Epistle to the Colossians*. Were the “others” then those Romans or those Colossians? They can hardly be identified with the Roman Christians, for these have not been mentioned. Such a reference to the Colossian Christians would be intelligible to those alone who had first read the epistle to that church. It seems best then to understand the “also” or “others” in quite a general way of those who know the matter already. At all events, the word “also” helps to emphasise the word “you.”

We may note that the word for “I [have] sent” is simply the epistolary aorist or indefinite past, used instead of “I send,” to place the writer at the reader’s point of view.

The phrase, "the things relating to me," found here and in *Col.* iv. 7, means simply "my affairs," as the similar phrases in *Tobit* x. 9, and 3 *Esdras* i. 24. Here in *Eph.* vi. 21, it will be noticed that St. Paul inserts "what," or rather "how I am doing," that is, "how I am faring," between "the things relating to me" and "all things." In the earlier epistle, *Col.* iv. 8, the Colossians are told of Tychicus' commission to learn their condition. In the later, *Eph.* vi. 22, the readers are told of his commission to describe St. Paul's state. In both he is appointed to encourage the hearts of those whom he visits. And in both he is introduced as "the beloved brother and faithful minister." The word "minister," *diákōnōs*, "deacon," does not appear to be used here in any technical sense, but merely implies an "attendant," as *hupēretēs*, "a servant," literally "an under-rower," did in the case of St. Mark, when he accompanied St. Paul and St. Barnabas, *Acts* xiii. 5. Blass, commenting on the latter word, suggests that it connoted the office of baptiser. But the word *hupēretēs*, "servant," is used of the Synagogue *chazzan*, *Luke* iv. 20, whose duty it was to take care of the Sacred Books and the building, and to teach the children to read. But there is really no ground for determining the functions of St. Mark or Tychicus. They helped the Apostle as they could, and as he needed.

The word "brother" was sufficiently common among the Jews, *Acts*, ii. 29, 37, iii. 17, ix. 17, though the Pharisees preferred to speak of their fellows as *chābhērīm*, "associates" or "comrades," Talmudic *Demai* ii. 3, vi. 6, 12. Among the Greek-speaking members of all religious associations under the Empire, the Greek word *adēlphōs*, "brother," uniformly denoted a member.

Onesimus also is described in the *Epistle to the Colossians*, iv. 9, as "the faithful and loved brother." Such a mention of his name in the public congregation would restore him

to its consideration. But in this epistle, Tychicus alone, as we have seen, is mentioned. The choice of him for the conveyance of the Pauline encyclical and more than Imperial rescript seems to have depended at least partly on his nationality. He was certainly a native of Roman or pro-consular Asia, *Acts* xx. 4. It is very probable that he was a native of its most important city, Ephesus, because he is mentioned with Trophimus, who also was described as an Asian, *Acts*, xx. 4, and was an Ephesian, *Acts* xxi. 29. This probability is greatly strengthened by the fact that he is sent to Ephesus now. It will be raised almost to a certainty by his second mission to that city in the summer of 66 A.D., 2 *Tim.* iv. 12. The name Tychicus as Lightfoot, in his *Colossians* p. 234, shows, is found in inscriptions of Asia Minor and Rome. It is also found on coins of Magnesia, thirteen miles from Ephesus, and of Magnesia by Mount Sipylus, where the bishop of Ephesus resides to-day, thirty-eight miles from his titular see.

If Stanley's conjecture, *Corinthians* 2nd ed. p. 493, were right, we should find both Tychicus and Trophimus in the two companions of Titus, when he was sent back to Corinth, after reporting the affairs of the Corinthian church to St. Paul at Philippi, in March 56. In the *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, which St. Paul wrote after the three had gone, he speaks of Titus' first companion as "the brother, whose praise in the Gospel is through all the churches," 2 *Cor.* viii. 18. And this brother has generally been identified by commentators, following Origen's *Homilies on St. Luke*, not with Tychicus, but with the third Evangelist, St. Luke.

Tychicus met us in the early part of 57, that is, four years ago. He then occupied a position of some importance as an Asian delegate in regard to the relief of Judæan Christians. St. Paul had proposed to sail from Corinth to keep the

Passover of 57, on Thursday, April 7, in Jerusalem. To avoid a Jewish plot, *Acts* xx. 3, he travels overland, keeps the Passover at Philippi, and reaches Troas on Tuesday, April 19. Here he meets the Asian delegates, representing especially Ephesus and the Lycus Valley. These were Tychicus and Trophimus, who had probably, as Ramsay suggests in his *St. Paul the Traveller* p. 287, intended to sail from Ephesus to Jerusalem with the Asian collection, but hearing that the Apostle's course had been altered, hastened to meet him, and found him in Troas. This simple statement has been confused by the loss of one letter *s* in the Greek Text. In *Acts* xx. 5, this going of the two to meet St. Paul, is expressed by the word *prōs-ēlthōntēs*, "going towards." Such is the reading found in the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B of the fourth century, in many other witnesses, and apparently in the Alexandrian A of the fifth. The first *s* is omitted by the Claromontanus D of the sixth century, by the Egyptian and Armenian versions, and by some other witnesses. So these offer us the word *prō-ēlthōntēs*, "going before," as if Tychicus and Trophimus had been in Europe with St. Paul, and gone on before him to Troas.

As an Asian delegate, Tychicus would naturally accompany St. Paul to Jerusalem, reaching it by Pentecost, May 28, 57. The Jews there suspect St. Paul of introducing Tychicus' co-delegate, Trophimus, into the Temple, *Acts* xxi. 29; and their riot occasions the Apostle's arrest.

Now, in this year 61, Tychicus stands before us for the second time. He holds the papyrus-scroll for the Laodiceans and that for the Colossians. He is waiting till St. Paul has finished dictating this encyclical, addressed primarily to the Ephesians. Then he will set out with Onesimus for Ephesus and Roman Asia.

So we have seen him in the spring of 57, and again in the

spring of 61. We shall not even hear any more of him till the autumn of 65. At that time, St. Paul will be proposing to winter at Nicopolis in Epirus, *Titus* iii. 12. The Apostle will then be at Miletus, and about to sail for Corinth. At the moment, Trophimus will be ill, *2 Tim.* iv. 20 ; and St. Paul will not have decided, whether it is Ártemas or Tychicus must go to Crete, *Titus* iii. 12. In the end, Tychicus will be sent to Ephesus, *2 Tim.* iv. 12.

The Greek Menology for December 9 represents Tychicus as the martyred successor of Sosthenes in the bishopric of Cólophon, nine miles from Ephesus.

Eph. vi. 23. The Apostolic Benediction.

There are no salutations ; and the Apostolic Benediction is in the third person.

**Eph. vi. 23. Peace to the brethren
And love with faith**

**From God, [the] Father
And Lord Jesus, [the] Christ.**

There is the ancient Hebrew salutation of "Peace." There is also the love and faith, of which the Apostle spoke at the commencement of the encyclical, *Eph.* i. 15. These are asked of God the Father and of Jesus, both placed on the same level, their names and titles being subsumed under the same preposition, and made parallel, the one group to the other.

This will remind us that in the year 61, only 31 years after the Crucifixion, the Creative Power of God, the Deity of Jesus and the Holy Spirit, the supernatural state and position of the Church, and the one Communion of the Saints are explicitly taught in the Christian Church.

Eph. vi. 24. St. Paul's Postscript.

We remember that Tertius, acting as St. Paul's secretary at Corinth in the January of 57, wrote in the epistle to the Roman church,

Rom. xvi. 22. I, Tertius, who am writing this letter,
I salute you in the Lord.

We remember also that St. Paul, in 49, about to start for the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem, dictated a hurried letter to the churches of Southern Galatia. At the end, he seizes the scribe's pen; and he himself writes the concluding paragraph, *Gal.* vi. 11-18, in larger letters to draw attention, in the way then and now common in public inscriptions and advertisements, to the great importance of his words.

Gal. vi. 11. Look you, with what large—mark you—letters,
I wrote with my own hand.

The verb "I wrote," is of course the epistolary aorist, the indefinite past, the writer placing himself at the reader's point of time. It may be rendered, "I am writing."

A conclusion in his own handwriting was St. Paul's attestation of his authorship. About August, 52, he ended his *Second Epistle to the Thessalonians* with the words,

2 *Thess.* iii. 17. The salutation with my own hand—
Paul's—

Which is a sign in every epistle—
So I am writing.

18. The grace of our Lord, Jesus Christ,
[Be] with you all.

Three years later, in the autumn of 55, he writes from

Ephesus to the Corinthian church ; and he himself closes the letter with his own hand.

1 Cor. xvi. 21. The salutation with my own hand—
Paul's—

22. If anyone does not love the Lord,
Let him be anathema.

MARANA
THA

23. The grace of the Lord Jesus [be] with you :
My love [be] with you all in Christ Jesus.

We may note in passing that the word *anathema* corresponds to the Hebrew word *chērem*, “devotion to destruction,” *Joshua* vi. 17, or “a curse,” *Malachi* iv. 6. It is something set apart ; and in the Greek Testament, it is something set apart for evil. *Māranā thā* is Syriac, and means “our Lord, come,” the phrase apparently being a watchword of the early Christians, *James* v. 8, *Phil.* iv. 5, *Apoc.* xxii. 20.

Now, in 61, we find the Apostle ending his *Epistle to Philemon* with the words,

Philem. 25. The grace of the Lord, Jesus Christ,
[Be] with your spirit.

Afterwards, he writes that to the Colossians, and ends it,

Col. iv. 18. The salutation with my own hand—
Paul's—

Be remembering my bonds.
The grace [be] with you.

And now, at this moment, he is concluding the encyclical,

Eph. vi. 24. The grace [be] with all,
Who are loving our Lord,
Jesus Christ,
In incorruption.

The form of the passage shows that the phrase "in incorruption" cannot be connected with "our Lord." But both those who connect it with "loving," and those who connect it with "grace," represent reasonable views. If the latter are right, then the lines,

Who are loving our Lord,
Jesus Christ,

are parenthetic; and their relation to the context may be made clear by brackets or otherwise. Armitage Robinson, in his commentary, p. 220, argues that the expression, "grace [be] with all in incorruption" is not a natural expansion of St. Paul's accustomed formula. And Soden will have it that the expression, "who are loving in incorruption" is untenable. But *aphtharsía*, "incorruption," does not, like *aphthōría*, mean "incorruption" in the sense of moral purity, but "incorruption" in the sense of immortality, indissolubility, as in *Wisd.* ii. 23, vi. 18, 4 *Macc.* ix. 22, xvii. 12, 1 *Cor.* xv. 42, 50, 53, 54, *Rom.* ii. 7, 2 *Tim.* i. 10. Therefore, neither Armitage Robinson's nor Soden's objection is fatal. For St. Paul could, at least in this unique encyclical, conclude by the prayer,

The Grace [that is, of God, be] with all
Indissolubly,

or by speaking of those,

Who are loving our Lord,
Jesus Christ,
Indissolubly.

The former expression, that is, "grace in immortality," is not far removed from St. Peter's "grace of life," that is, "grace of eternal life," 1 *Pet.* iii. 7. And the latter expression, that is, "to love in immortality," or immortally,

indissolubly, is as legitimate as St. John's "to love in truth," or truly, 2 *John* 1, 3 *John* 1. But we must confess that regard to the order of the words and the smoothness of the sentence would lead us to connect the phrase "in incorruption" with the clause,

Who are loving our Lord,
Jesus Christ.

Eph. vi. 24. A Disputed Reading "amen."

"Amen" is added by some witnesses. But it is suspect, because the liturgical use of the word, illustrated by 1 *Cor.* xiv. 16, in 55 A.D., and by St. Justin Martyr's *First Apology* lxxv, in 150 A.D., grew in the Church, according to St. Jerome's commentary in 387 A.D., on *Galatians* ii. pref., and in the Synagogue, according to the Talmudic *Aboda Zara* 65a, and *Shabbath* 119b, compiled between 180 and 500 A.D. The word would be added to the end of a book even more naturally than the liturgical doxology was added to the Lord's Prayer in the common Greek Text of *St. Matthew* vi. 13. To illustrate this by one or two witnesses in certain cases, we may point out that "amen" is added to *St. Matthew* in the Alexandrian A, to *St. Mark* in the Ephraem C, to *St. Luke* in the Vatican B and the Alexandrian A, to *St. John* in the Sangerman E, to the *Acts* in St. Chrysostom, and to 2 *Corinthians* in Claromontanus D. In *Galatians* and *Romans*, it appears to belong to the text, and more than probably in 1 *Corinthians*.

In the present case, we must quote St. Chrysostom in its favour, because the quotation in Cramer's *Caténæ* vi. 225, of 1842, cannot outweigh the printed text, p. 213, the latter being supported by the "amen" in Theodoret, who followed St. Chrysostom. To these two, St. Chrysostom before 398, and Theodoret about 423 we must add the

Syriac Vulgate of 411, the Harclean Syriac of 616, the second corrector of the Sinaitic Aleph in Cent. vii., the Porphyrian P, of Cent. ix., the undoubtedly Syrian Text of the Moscovian K and the Angelic L, and the Syrian Text of the cursives, 47, of Cent. xi., and 37, of Cent. xv. This body of evidence may be taken in this place as Syrian.

The Ethiopic version, made about 600, must be left out of account, for Platt's edition of 1830 inserts the "amen"; and the Roman edition of 1549 omits it. As to the Egyptian versions, the Bohairic of northern Egypt inserts the word; and the Bashmuric of the Fayyum omits it.

The Syrian evidence is in favour of the word. The Western Text includes it in the fourth and sixth centuries to abandon it later. Its presence in that text is not surprising, but it is difficult to explain the later absence. Victorinus and Ambrosiaster in Rome about 360, have the word. The Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., with which we should reckon its ninth century copy, the Sangerman E, has it. It is also found in the Fuldensis manuscript of the Latin Vulgate in 540 A.D., and in the Gothic version, which became affected with Old Latin readings after 568 A.D. But in the eighth century the word disappears, according to the Amiatinus manuscript of the Latin Vulgate, made just before 716, and the Toletanus, in the same century. In the ninth century, the word is absent from the Greek and Latin columns of the Augien F and its twin, the Boernerian G, made in Italy. In the eleventh century, it is absent from the cursive 73, which has some Western elements; in the twelfth or thirteenth century, from the Demidovianus manuscript of the Latin Vulgate; and in 1592, from the Clementine Vulgate. So far, it would appear that the word was interpolated in the Latin Text in the fourth century, and removed in the eighth.

The evidence in favour of the word is by no means convincing. Indeed, we cannot regard the word as Scripture, when we consider the nature of its Syrian support, the remarkable change in the Latin testimony, the liability of the word to be inserted, and the force of the contrary testimony. It is omitted by the Neutral Text of the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, both probably of Caesarea and the year 331, and by the Alexandrian Text of the Alexandrian A, of the early fifth century, and the cursive 17, of Cent. ix. or x., as well as by the Western Text of the twin manuscripts, the Augien F and the Boernerian G, of cent. ix. To these, we must add the quotation from Origen, head of the Alexandrian School in 203, as given in Cramer's *Caténæ* in this passage, as well as the Armenian version, made after 431, the Alexandrian Euthalius in 458, according to the palimpsest of 1301, and the cursive 73, of Cent. xi.

The Subscription.

To the various books of the Greek Testament, as to the various books of the Massorettes' Hebrew Bible, notes were added. At first, these were quite simple, merely reproducing the title of the book. But afterwards, as Miller's *Scrivener* says, "Introduction," I. 65, "the titles become more elaborate and the subscriptions afford more information, the truth of which it would hardly be safe to vouch for."

So the Sinaitic Aleph and the Vatican B, both probably of 331 and representing the Neutral or Early Alexandrian Text, with the Alexandrian A, of the early fifth century, and the cursive 17, of the ninth or tenth, both presenting an Alexandrian Text, simply repeat the title "To Ephesians" as the subscription of the book. With them agree the Bashmuri or Fayyumic version from Egypt and the cursive 135 of Cent. xi. The testimony of the

Claromontanus D, of Cent. vi., is really the same. There we find a repetition of the title "To Ephesians," followed immediately by the title of the next book, "To Colossians." These words are indeed written at the foot of the page, but it is not necessary to suppose with some that want of room prevented the scribe from adding more.

Additions will be made in three ways, which we may distinguish as the Hebrew, the Greek and the Latin.

The Hebrew mode will indicate the length of the book. Greeks and Romans measured even their prose by lines of fifteen or sixteen syllables, each line being called originally an *ēpos*, and afterwards a *stichos*. Euthalius, who was an Alexandrian deacon, when he published his edition of *St. Paul's Epistles* in 458, was the first, as far as we know, to count the *stichoi* or lines of those books. In the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, he notes *ti b*, that is, 312 *stichoi* or lines, 2 lections, 10 *titloi* or chapters, and 6 testimonies or quotations from the Old Testament. Three ninth century manuscripts, the Moscovian K and the Angelic L, both Syrian in text, with the Porphyrian P, follow Euthalius in adding "*stichoi* 312." The cursive 7, of Cent. xi., changes the number into *sp b*, that is, 282.

We may give the name of the Greek mode to such an addition as conveyed some information, reliable or otherwise, regarding the circumstances under which the book was written. So, to the title "To Ephesians," will be added the words "it was written from Rome." This is found in the Bohairic version, made about 200 or 250, in St. Chrysostom before 398, in the Syriac Vulgate, made in 411, in Theodoret about 423, in Euthalius in 458, in the Harclean Syriac of 616, in the ninth-century manuscripts of which we have spoken, that is, the Moscovian K, the Angelic L and the Porphyrian P. It was added by the first corrector of the fourth-century Vatican B, and by the

first corrector of the sixth-century Claromontanus Old Latin d, each corrector working in the century in which his manuscript was made. Among the cursives, it will be found in 12, of Cent. ix., 47 and 80, of Cent. xi., 44, of Cent. xiii., and 37, of Cent. xv. All these witnesses, except the corrector of the Vatican B and the Porphyrian P, will add "by means of Tychicus." And the Angelic L will form a more complete sentence by inserting the words, "this epistle."

What we may name the Latin mode has regard not so much to the amount which the scribe has copied, or to the facts of interest to the student, but to the duty of the reader, so that he may announce when one book ends and another begins. Therefore, in the Old Latin of the sixth-century Claromontanus d, and of the ninth-century Augien f and Boernerian g, as well as in the Vulgate Latin of the Fuldensis manuscript in 540 and of the Amiatinus manuscript just before 716, we find a note, which may be illustrated in English by, "Here endeth *to Ephesians* : here beginneth *to Philippians*." The Gothic version, influenced by the Old Latin version after the Lombards' invasion of Italy in 568, has "Here endeth *to Ephesians* "; but it does not add "Here beginneth *to Philippians*," because that beginning is lacking. The Augien f and the Boernerian g insert the Latin word for "the epistle." Therefore the word, absent from the Sangerman E, of Cent. ix., is found in the Greek subscription in the Augien F and in the Boernerian G, the note in each case being translated from the Latin column. The Sangerman E uses *ēplērōthē* for "ended," and passes to *Colossians* ; the Augien F and the Boernerian G employ *ētēlēsthē*, and pass to *Philippians*.

CONCLUSION

THE ENCYCLICAL IN THE MODERN WORLD

We have followed the pen of St. Paul's scribe, as it covered the transient papyrus-scroll with a story, that began and will end in eternity. With whatever difficulty, we caught glimpses of all that the seer was seeing. We beheld the map of that total Universe, which philosophers outline in dream, and would fain explain. For all the dullness of our ears, we heard some echoes of that final harmony, which is formed by the innumerable chords of being, each with innumerable tones. In the sixth century before Christ, Pythagoras pictured the seven planets as a heptachord for the music of the spheres. In the nineteenth century after Christ, Bradley, in the chapter on " Ultimate Doubts " in his *Appearance and Reality*, held that reality must include, and must harmonise every possible fragment of appearance. And Meredith, in *Martin's Puzzle* x., asked

Is the Universe one immense Organ, that rolls
From devils to angels ?

But in the century when the Messiah appeared, St. Paul unveiled for us the mystery of Incarnate God as the centre in the web of being. He showed us God's purpose of extending the Messiah's dominion over every province of

the cosmic Empire, and of drawing all the worth of all the world to the Messiah as its goal. He did more. He told us how human souls share the Divine Life in union and communion with the Messiah, and so identified with Him that they are members of His Mystical Body. Then we saw the meaning of God's kingdom and the significance of the Catholic Church.

Our individual life has its own relation to God ; and moral, ascetic and mystical theology unfolds the roads, by which the conscience is purged, trained and made concordant with the Divine Will. Our congregational life also has its relation to God ; and St. John's Epistles to the Seven Churches of Roman Asia will show us how God regards the various types of local churches, which we know so well and so misjudge. But our supernatural life has a third and grander activity. If the Confessional may serve as a symbol of the individual life, and the Pulpit of the congregational, the Altar symbolises the Catholic life in the reach of its influence, in the unity and universality of its outlook, and in its identification with the Christ.

Here, however, we touch a matter, repellent to the sensitive, and provocative to the warlike among those Protestants, whose generosity concedes us a hearing. Yet the printed page may perhaps speak without offence, for there is no nervous twitching of the lip to be mistaken for scorn, and no enthusiasm in its glance to be interpreted as the insolence of triumph. Therefore, let it boldly say that the nineteenth century was an age of partial views, each claiming to be complete. Karl Marx, for example, proclaimed Socialism, and the absolute authority of the State. Bakûnin became the herald of Social Democracy, and announced the absolute right of the individual to live without God or master. The Universe was explained by Hegel as only Thought, by Schopenhauer as only Will, by Feuerbach as

only Sensation, and by much smaller men as only Matter. In these and so many other cases, secular and sacred, a province was described as the Empire, a sect as the Church.

The consequences were inevitable. The fragment that pretended to be a whole, fell into fragments. The formula that would explain and harmonise all things, was found to be a confusion of contradictions. And the sect, even though it had the heroism and unworldliness of the Plymouth Brethren, split into sects. But besides the brittleness of the broken and the self-contradiction of the contradicting, there was the imperfection of the incomplete. The soul, housed in its sect or formula, became aware of other dwellings outside its door. That these were different from its own provoked its resentment and wounded its vanity, at least, a little. But in the stillness, when the drums of rhetoric had ceased to roll their mimic thunders over the preacher's pulpit, the philosopher's arm-chair and the politician's wine-glass, there arose a sense of want; and the soul felt the need of satisfaction beyond the limits of its little world.

That is one of the most pathetic moments in man's pathetic life. In some men, there follows a flight from one partial truth to another, from one sect to the most hostile of hostile sects, from one extreme to the other. The impulse is felt in all our activities. A man, devoted to literature, will at times regard his life as a mistake, and wish for a plough in some distant land. Nor does this impulse wait upon such an overmastering motive as that, which Browning expressed in *One Word More*. It needs only a sense of the loss involved in limitation, and then,

Does he paint? he fain would write a poem,—
Does he write? he fain would paint a picture.

There are less heroic souls, who meet the crisis otherwise.

Not theirs the joys and sorrows of the convert, who left his limited life for a larger one, and found isolation. Even while they are reproached for lack of courage, they applaud themselves for possession of prudence. Their inherited position, whether it be one in politics, or in philosophy, or in religion, has many advantages. Their lives are interwoven with those of the other members; and they are at home in the conventional opinions and mannerisms. To go out alone into the wilderness spells utter perplexity and the outlawed life of Ishmael. And to enter another sect may waken the resentment of those within it, who regard a stranger's approach as that of a claimant for a share in the hereditary property. No doubt, his new comrades, however little they would be his friends or even his companions, would praise his conversion as an act of homage to themselves. Ignorant of the intellectual and moral treasure, which he has brought from his own hereditary party, sect, or point of view, they would assume his mind to be a blank, and his will to have been proved irresolute by his change. They could not know how much of that process was a leap in the dark, in spite of the claim which they themselves made with so little moral nobleness or æsthetic beauty to speak in the name of reason or of God. Least of all, would they understand that the convert's leap was nerved by a conviction. Yet one conviction in politics, religion, or philosophy, is nobler, mightier and more fruitful than a multitude of inherited conventions and opinions.

Those prudent persons, who prefer the hearth of their infancy, though the smoke from the fireplace clouds the atmosphere a little, and the windows afford a narrow view, import some of the goods, which their own dwelling cannot make. A touching instance of this may be found in those Presbyterians, who borrowed ritual and offices, and named

themselves the Catholic Apostolic Church. It explains a politician's act, which is described in a politician's language as stealing the clothes of his opponent, found bathing.

An example of great significance for the historian and the theologian is that of the triple movement within the Anglican communion. Those who felt their need of personal religion formed the Low Church Party, and found much help in Wesleyanism. Others needed an authority, that could speak with the voice of Catholic Antiquity, and a ritual, that implied Catholic Sacrifice and Sacrament. Though these men retained the fruits of the Lutheran revolt and the Tudor schism, they reached out their hands for *the Roman Ceremonial* and Migne's edition of the Fathers, and became the High Church Party. There were yet others, whose minds probed deeper, and demanded more than the Pietist Revival and the Oxford Movement. Rationalists by training and sceptical by temperament, they sought a basis in philosophy. They would not surrender the language of the Bible and the Liturgy, but they were as influenced by the Unitarian Martineau, as the High Church Party by the Catholic Newman, and the Low Church Party by the Baptist Spurgeon. It needed no ghost, come from the dead, to tell us that the Broad Church Party would one day modify the meaning of their creeds, when these inherited expressions of faith would have seemed inconsistent with borrowed expressions of reason. Not that party alone, but High and Low also, feels its fires cool, its activity passing into history, and itself waiting for a new age.

No one who has in any measure experienced the difficulties of religion, and tasted the bitter discord between the soul's life and the forms, religious, social and political, in which it is found, will speak without sympathy of those, who venture forth to other lands, or of those who remain

at home. Both classes have been represented by men of good will and keen intelligence. And we may easily find two representatives of each among men, whose souls were illumined by some words of this great Encyclical.

First of all, there is Conyers, whose name is enshrined by Cowper in his *Truth*. To those, who said they could not enter Heaven, though it was open, the poet called the theologian to answer :

“ Because ye will not, Conyers would reply.”

But the best memorial of the man is the sermon, which the Rev. John Newton delivered in St. Paul's, Deptford, on Sunday, May 7, 1786, after “ the death of Richard Conyers, LL.D., late Rector of that Parish.” The preacher told of those labours, which had gained Dr. Conyers the reputation of being the most exemplary, indefatigable and successful, parochial minister in the kingdom. Mr. Newton told also of the interior dissatisfaction, felt by his friend, till prayer and study of the Sacred Scriptures found him a new world in the one phrase, “ the unsearchable riches of Christ,” *Eph.* iii. 8. Those words of the encyclical showed him the limits of his themes, opened for him new depths of grace in our Blessed Lord, and inflamed his soul with devotion to the Crucified. True, he lost much of the applause, which good people had been willing to give him. But his heart was satisfied ; satisfied with personal religion.

Dr. Charles Gore is a man of deep, personal piety and extraordinary charm. Too imaginative for a philosopher, and too analytic for a poet, he excels in addressing men. In reading his work on *the Epistle to the Ephesians*, we see at once the influence of the encyclical over his mind and heart. For him, the writer is the Apostle of Catholicity. And if he, like Dr. Conyers, remains in his inherited position, he,

like Dr. Conyers, regards that position through the medium of this epistle.

It is easy to distinguish Dr. Gore's own substantial thought in the exposition from merely professional pronouncements, and from the treasures which he has gathered among earlier interpreters. It is true that at times he presents his thought a little tinged with an antipopery, more becoming in much smaller men. Treating the Catholic view of Church unity as completely summed up in the unity of faith, worship and government, he concludes that such is only an outward association of individuals to attain a certain end by submitting to a common authority in matters of belief and worship, p. 153. He complains that the unity of spiritual life, which St. Paul and St. Hilary put distinctly first, becomes secondary or subordinate. Unfortunately, like many another critic of Catholic doctrine, Dr. Gore forgot that it cannot be gathered from a single sentence. Those few words, which seem so incomplete to him, imply the Catholic doctrine of Sanctifying Grace, the Divine Presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church, and our Lord's institution of a Teaching Authority for the world.

So, misunderstanding the Catholic conception, and equally inexperienced as regards the Nonconformist, but thoroughly conversant with the Anglican, Dr. Gore would abandon all lower conceptions, whether "Roman, or Anglican, or Nonconformist," to meditate on St. Paul's great and manifold ideal of the Church. He has so meditated to much purpose. But the enlargement of his vision has not been followed by an enlargement of his reach. On the contrary, he has retired within the home of his childhood, urging his companions "in each parish and ecclesiastical centre, to concentrate almost more than to extend the Church, to give it spiritual, moral and social reality, rather than to

multiply a membership which means little," *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, p. 120.

In contrast to Dr. Conyers and Dr. Gore, stand two representatives of those, who went forth abandoning their inheritance to gain all or nothing. It is permissible, surely, to compare these pilgrim souls with Ibsen's Brand, without implying that those, who stay by their father's fireside are mere compromisers like Ibsen's Peer Gynt. And if the men, who venture forth, irritate dull and conventional unintelligences, they attract interest, and often win loyalty, when their death has soothed jealousy to sleep.

Two such men found their point of departure in *the Epistle to the Ephesians*, John Nelson Darby and Henry Manning. Of the former, I heard much from some of the Plymouth Brethren who had known him. One told me how he left his practice in the Dublin Four Courts to become the Protestant Curate of the Calary parish in Wicklow. Hardly had he been there two years, when he, in 1827, at the ripe age of 26 years, wrote his protest against Dr. Magee, the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, for basing his opposition to Catholic Emancipation on the subserviency of the Protestant Establishment to the State. Darby held that such a plea reduced his communion to a department of the Civil Service. And his restlessness was further stimulated by the pluralism and worldliness of his brother ministers, by the degradation of the Anglican rite to a political test, and by the interest in prophecy, which he had acquired indirectly from Irving, and directly from Bible-readings in Lady Powerscourt's house in the next parish.

Living in a peasant's cottage, and so careless of personal comfort that once a penny was thrown to him in the street, he spent his time in prayer, alms and study of the Bible. At last, in 1833, came the day, of which I have heard from

my friend, the late Henry Heatley, Plymouth Brother and embodiment of all we mean by a Christian, a scholar and a gentleman. As Darby stood in his pulpit, and preached from the *Epistle to the Ephesians* on the position of the saints in the heavenlies, his soul shuddered with a sudden consciousness of the contrast between his words and his surroundings. After that service, he laid down his surplice and black band for ever.

It was easy in that Evangelical period to find men and women of personal piety, who lived in the Bible, and wished to realise the life of the primitive Church. To them Darby appealed, and successfully. Among them was Francis Newman, who went out as a missionary to the East, only to return in the meshes of Scripture difficulties, woven by a Muhammadan carpenter at Aleppo and an English wastrel at Baghdad. For him then Darby had no sympathy; and the sad, troubled soul went forth to open the sluices of scepticism.

It is not a little interesting to note by the way that four currents of great influence upon the course of the nineteenth century arose in very small Calvinist circles. For to such an origin, we must trace Darby, of disintegrating Evangelicalism, John Henry Newman, of integrating Catholicism, his brother, Francis Newman, of Unitarian Theism, and Thomas Carlyle, of speculative Pantheism.

Darby and his friends held the Church of God to be in ruins. On that basis, they united without a regular ministry, and "broke bread" every Sunday morning in the mode which an unhistorical imagination represented as apostolic. Indignant with the sects, and especially with Arminian Methodism, they desired to shun sectarianism, and refused to acknowledge themselves as a sect. Ignoring the name "Plymouth Brethren," they spoke of themselves as "the Brethren." And once, when Darby overheard some

one in the street speak of him and his companions as Darbyites, he said that it was bad to be called after a place, but worse to be called after a man.

They, who had desired to avoid sectarianism, split into sects. Newton and his friends were cut off in 1848, as unsound on the doctrine of our Lord's Deity. The Müllerites were excluded for sympathy with Newton, or for want of antipathy towards him. William Kelly and his followers were cut off, and became the Kellyites; Cluff and his friends formed the Cluffites; and a few years after Darby's death at Bournemouth on April 29, 1882, the remnant of true Darbyites was rent by the schism of the Stuartites.

The Epistle to the Ephesians was also the occasion of Henry Manning's leaving home for another communion. He was standing at the moment on the threshold of his birthplace, the Church of England. Like Darby, he was being repelled by its Erastian spirit and subjection to the Royal Supremacy in matters of faith. Unlike Darby, he would not form a new association, because, said he to Robert Wilberforce, "Three hundred years ago, we left a good ship for a boat; I am not going to leave the boat for a tub." Until now, as he wrote later in his *Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost* p. 29, explaining his sermon on November 5, 1843, before Oxford University, he had regarded the unity of the Church as "a constitutional law, springing from external organisation, highly beneficial, but not a vital necessity to the Church."

But now it happened, as when the "Ideas" of Plato, starlike in their solitary splendours, became the "Idea" of Hegel through their flowing each one into the others, till the Real Universe became visible to the imagination as a network of fluent light. Writing on December 11, 1850, Manning says, "But after all, Holy Scripture seems

to me in a new light, as *Ephes.* iv. 4-17. This seems to preclude the notion of a divided unity, which is in fact Arianism in the matter of the Church." Then he adds, "I entirely feel what you say of the alternatives. It is Rome, or license of thought and will." But *the Epistle to the Ephesians* had taught him still more. Had Hegel become a Catholic, he might have written as Manning wrote three days later, "The baptismal name expands into the belief. The belief expands into the *Theologia* of the Catholic Church, from St. Augustine, through the *Summa* of St. Thomas, to the Council of Trent. It has unity, continuity, harmony, integrity, and what have we?" It would have surprised Manning, had he been told that the Hegelian Erdmann would within fifteen years explain the same history in almost the same language. Having said that the Church Fathers understood belief as the message of the Apostles in the Bible, Erdmann, in his *History of Philosophy* I. § 151, adds that "the Fathers have produced the dogmas; the Schoolmen have to systematise them and to make them comprehensible." So the process is made to illustrate the Hegelian development from the word to the proposition, and from the proposition to the syllogism.

For Manning, the Pauline Encyclical provided enough to fill and overfill his formula. It gives him his very language, when he says in his *Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost* p. 29. that the unity of the Church "flows from the unity of its Head, of its Life, of its mind and of its will; or, in other words, from the unity of the Person of the Incarnate Son, who reigns in it, and of the Holy Ghost, who organises it by His inhabitation, sustains it by His presence, and speaks through it by His voice." The encyclical is again evident in the very word "development," applied to a human body as a figure of the Church. For Manning continues, "The external unity, therefore, is

not the cause, but the effect of a vital law, which informs and governs the organisation of the Mystical Body, springing from within, and manifesting itself without, like as the animation and development of the body of a man, which springs from a vital principle, one and indivisible in its operations and its essence."

Since Manning's time, the same great Epistle has moved such men as Westcott, Armitage Robinson and Gore to crave for the unity, which it pictures. But for them, as for so many others, the line of schism has proved more impassable than Wallace's line between the islands of Bali and Lombok for the separated fauna.

But after Manning's conversion, the attitude of men towards these and all such problems changed. We remember how Schopenhauer led a reaction against Hegelian intellectualism, just as Duns Scotus had led a reaction against Thomism about the year 1300, and just as William James, about the year 1900, will lead a reaction with pluralism and pragmatism against the Absolutism of Bradley. The reaction, which followed the Oxford Movement, may explain why Newman's and Manning's books became so interesting as *Odysseys* and so ineffective as *Apologies*. Indeed it will be within the memory of all serious men, that able and conscientious souls abandoned the field of sacred literature and that of physical nature to find God and the Christian Religion in the needs of their own inmost souls. Psychology reigned on the throne of Revelation. But the new king's coronation was swiftly followed by his deposition.

With the twentieth century has come another era, one to which the Pauline Encyclical might well have been addressed. The very presentiment of Absolutists and Pluralists, of Socialists and Individualists, of Intellectualists and Voluntarists, that their battles will be drawn, leads

them to exchange their reproaches for compliments. It suggests to those, who have not committed themselves for good or evil to one of these parties, that there may be a better and surer and richer position than that occupied by any one of these combatants. There is also another antithesis, which we may easily overlook ; though it is of peculiar significance at this point. The last century substituted dynamics for statics, and history for mechanics in men's view of the world. Development and evolution surpassed Aladdin's lamp in magical power. Many men, therefore, devoted themselves to questions of origin. But, at the same time, others were occupied with questions of value. In the study of the Gospels, for example, some spent time and labour on the Synoptic Problem, others on the historical accuracy. Generally speaking, Biblicists became fascinated by the search for sources, and dogmatic theologians by methods of apologetics. But in this, as in metaphysics and politics, the provincial character of each faction suggested a position, more imperial and catholic. And the boast that the twentieth century, which inherits the imperialism of the nineteenth, is to be also the century of the small nations, shows us in what direction we may look for the solution.

A sect cannot satisfy men. Nor can men be drawn in any number to pass from one sect to another. In this connection, we may do well to remember that it is possible to occupy the Catholic position in a sectarian spirit, and even to enter the Catholic Church on sectarian grounds. And having regard to the results of sectarianism, we may explain the indifference of many in the presence of religious conflicts as a Gallio's contempt for what seem to him but petty disputes. The bitterness of others is not seldom a Mercutio's curse on both the houses, responsible for his wound.

The more life and fuller, for which men crave, is certainly not attainable by schism or faction or exclusiveness. It is the social tragedy of dissent that it removed so many excellent people from the stream of national activity. It is the religious tragedy of dissent, that it removed its people from the flood of Catholic life. Church history is not their history. And when they would find something of their own in those earlier centuries, which filled the world with lofty thought, mighty labour and profound emotion, they are compelled to disinter some leader of revolt, and array him in misfitting garments for their own company. Even so, the sense of loneliness and exclusion remains. The hunger of the soul for God, for the living God, its longing for real worship, its sympathy with the poor, and all its heroism, unrecorded in the chanceries of earth, cannot save Nonconformity from the fate of fragments.

But an abstract unity is worse fated, for its comprehensiveness is purchased by a reduction of ideals to their lowest common denominator. So the individual life loses itself to gain nothing. If, then, Nonconformity is moral in the sense of the individual conscience, Anglicanism becomes moral in the sense of social convention.

In contrast to Nonconformity and Anglicanism, there is a concrete unity. This, however, is in harmony with Nonconformity in respect of variety and multiplicity. It is also in harmony with Anglicanism in respect of unity. Yet, it is opposed to Nonconformity, as the One is opposed to the Many. And it is opposed to Anglicanism, as wealth of matter is opposed to what is formal.

Wherever such a concrete unity can be found, it will be the modern representative of the Church, which St. Paul describes in this encyclical. The whole race of men, this planet, the whole sphere, bounded by the polar nebulae and the Milky Way, the Angelic orders, and the Eternal

Life of God enrich it now and hereafter. For ever and for ever, its life grows in fulness and vastness. And its Head, the Centre of the Universe, is the Christ, Incarnate God.

To find Him is to find both the One and the Many. In Him, intellect and will, the social order and the individual conscience, self-realisation and self-renunciation, all antitheses and antinomies find their solution. But just as it is fatal in thought to take a fragment of the truth, and present it as a whole, so is it fatal in life to represent anything as complete in itself. Even the Christ, as the Apostle dares to describe Him, is incomplete without His Church. She is His Bride, His Body, Himself. His Life, His activity, His Kingdom are Hers. All the vast scheme of things, from the ether of physical science and the primal matter of metaphysical science, to angels and the Deified Body and Soul of Jesus, is a sphere for that Divine activity, for which we have no nearer analogy than the beautiful playtime of childhood. In this, all is ours, for Christ is ours, as we are His. There pain and struggle only serve to enrich the life. Nothing but the isolation of sin can mar it.

Because He, the Messiah, is its centre, we ask where was He, before the sects arose. Not with this man or that man alone, for His presence is essential to the Church, which He proclaimed invincible. Where He was then, He is now. In His presence, and kneeling before Him, we are not troubled by the scandals, which He predicted. Everything is then seen in its true perspective. The vastness and the wealth of the world, which He opens to us, uplift and overwhelm our souls. Such moments are free from fear and care, for ours is He, the Ideal Christ of God's Eternal Purpose, who became through Mary the Real Christ of man's eternal need. In Him, in His Truth and in His Life, and there alone, we find unity and completeness.

GENERAL INDEX.

- Abbott, 4, 123, 200
 Adoption, 58
 Albinus, 7
 Alexandrian Text, 42
 Amen, 284, 512
 Apocalypse, 8, 70, 128
 Aristarchus, 14
 Atonement, 65
 Barnabas, 32
Barnabas, 63
 Bitterness, 369
 Boadicea, 5, 181
 Chronology, 29
 Church, 151, 285
 Clamour, 370
 Claudius, 36
 Clement of Alexandria, 12
 Clement of Rome, 8, 427
 Conyers, 522
 Darby, 3, 524
 Demas, 15
 Doxologies, 119, 278
 Election, 54
 Enlightenment, 411
 Epaphras, 14
 Ephesus, 26
 Eusebius, 22
 Felix, 37, 39
 Festus, 39
 Gaius, 30
 Gallio, 37
 Gentiles, 137
 Goodness, 372, 402
 Gore, 4, 522
 Grace, 157
 Hermas, 11, 209
 Herod Agrippa I., 30, 31
 Herod Agrippa II., 6, 40, 228
 Holiness, 332
 Ignatius, 11, 488
 Irenaeus, 12, 458
 James, the Greater, 31
 James, the Less, 29, 33
 Jews, 143
 John, the Apostle, 9
 Josephus, 185
 Justice, 348
 Love-feasts, 421
 Luke, 15, 39
 Manning, 524
 Marcion, 23
 Mark, 16
 Moody, 3
 Nero, 6, 437
 Neutral Text, 42
 Onesimus, 13, 468
 Peter, the Apostle, 7, 33, 198
 Philemon, 13
 Philo, 30, 120
 Piety, 354
 Plymouth Brethren, 1, 524
 Polycarp, 10, 177
 Predestination, 56
 Redemption, 64
 Sanctification, 60
 Seneca, 6, 13, 35, 420
 Submission, 427
 Syrian Text, 43
 Tarsus, 32
 Timothy, 15, 35
 Titus, 38, 506
 Tychicus, 14, 503
 Uncharitableness, 369
 Valentinus, 11, 133, 484
 Versatility, 390
 Westcott, 4, 446, 528
 Western Text, 41
 Wisdom, 416
 Wrath, 359

INDEX OF IMPORTANT SCRIPTURE REFERENCES.

Genesis	PAGE	Isaiah	PAGE
i. 26 - - -	71	xxvi. 19 - - -	410
xxxvii. 1 - - -	266	xxviii. 16 - - -	210
Exodus		lii. 7 - - -	196, 491
iv. 22 - - -	202	lix. 17 - - -	488
xv. 17 - - -	220	lx. 1 - - -	410
xxiii. 13 - - -	389	lxiii. 10 - - -	368
Leviticus		lxiii. 16 - - -	203
xix. 1-3 - - -	461	Jeremiah	
Deuteronomy		iii. 4 - - -	203
xxxii. 6 - - -	202	iii. 14 - - -	203
xxxii. 9 - - -	75, 103	Lamentations	
Ezra		i. 10 - - -	186
iv. 7 - - -	50	Daniel	
Job		ii. 8 - - -	418
xi. 8, 9 - - -	270	Hosea	
Psalms		xi. 1 - - -	202
ii. 7, 8 - - -	72	Amos	
viii. 7-9 - - -	71	iii. 2 - - -	262
xli. 1 - - -	487	iii. 7 - - -	70
xliv. 23 - - -	410	Zephaniah	
xlvi. 3 - - -	366	iii. 12 - - -	289
lxviii. 19 - - -	301	Zechariah	
ciii. 13 - - -	203	viii. 16 - - -	357
cx. 1 - - -	115	Malachi	
Proverbs		i. 6 - - -	204
xxiii. 31 - - -	421	ii. 10 - - -	204
Ecclesiastes		Matthew	
x. 12 - - -	366	iii. 17 - - -	63
Wisdom		v. 39 - - -	486
i. 1 - - -	470	v. 48 - - -	353, 383
v. 17-19 - - -	488	vi. 33 - - -	354
viii. 7 - - -	350	xvi. 18, 19 - - -	212
Sirach		xxviii. 18-20 - - -	197
xviii. 17 - - -	61	Mark	
xxi. 16 - - -	366	xiv. 61 - - -	51
Isaiah		xvi. 15 - - -	234
i. 2 - - -	202	Luke	
ix. 2 - - -	410	i. 28 - - -	61
xi. 2 - - -	95	ii. 14 - - -	59
xi. 4, 5 - - -	487	vi. 36 - - -	384

		PAGE		PAGE
Luke			I Corinthians	
xi. 13 -	-	95	ii. 7 -	243
xxi. 28 -	-	66	iii. 9 -	268
John			iii. 10 -	416
i. 9 -	-	243	iv. 15 -	236
i. 14-16 -	- 132,	133	vi. 11 -	441
ii. 19 -	-	187	vi. 16 -	449
iii. 13 -	-	304	vii. 20-24 -	467
iii. 20 -	-	405	xi. 3 -	435
viii. 43 -	-	86	xii. 4-6 -	293
x. 16 -	-	234	xii. 8-10 -	298
x. 18 -	-	114	xii. 12, 13, 21 -	128
xii. 36 -	-	401	xii. 13 -	291
xiii. 34 -	-	385	xii. 26 -	330
xiv. 20 -	-	266	xiii. 12 -	96
xv. 3 -	-	442	xiv. 24, 25 -	405
xvii. 24 -	-	55	xv. 24-28 -	126
xx. 17 -	- 52,	93	xvi. 13 -	480
Acts			xvi. 21-23 -	510
ii. 39 -	-	198	2 Corinthians	
iii. 26 -	-	198	i. 3 -	51
ix. 5 -	-	445	i. 4 -	62
xiii. 46, 47 -	-	229	i. 5 -	259
xv. 17 -	-	233	i. 6 -	280
xx. 28 -	-	440	i. 22 -	80
xxii. 21 -	- 224,	229	v. 1 -	216
xxii. 28 -	-	173	v. 10 -	472
xxvi. 16-18 -	-	228	v. 19 -	374
xxvi. 28 -	-	230	vi. 14 -	405
xxviii. 28 -	-	229	xi. 2 -	440
Romans			Galatians	
i. 21, 22 -	-	334	i. 10 -	470
v. 1, 2 -	-	201	i. 15, 16 -	228
vi. 2-5 -	-	154	ii. 8 -	238
viii. 26 -	-	500	ii. 20 -	322, 385, 440
viii. 39 -	-	272	iii. 14 -	235
ix. 22, 23 -	-	104	iv. 16 -	329
ix. 25, 26 -	-	233	vi. 11 -	509
x. 14, 15 -	-	158	vi. 15 -	163
xi. 8 -	-	336	Philippians	
xii. 2 -	- 403,	421	ii. 9 -	124
xii. 4, 5 -	-	129	ii. 13 -	168
xii. 6-8 -	-	298	iv. 6 -	499
xii. 12, 13 -	-	500	iv. 7 -	491
xiii. 12, 14 -	-	482	iv. 18 -	386
xiv. 17 -	-	424	Colossians	
xv. 2 -	-	362	i. 4 -	91
xv. 14 -	-	403	i. 9 -	136
xvi. 22 -	-	509	i. 11 -	265
xvi. 25 -	-	243	i. 13, 14 -	62

Colossians	PAGE	1 Thessalonians	PAGE
i. 16, 17 -	- 135	iv. 3 -	- 55
i. 18 -	- 130	iv. 7 -	- 55
i. 19 -	- 131	v. 5 -	- 401
i. 19-22 -	- 194	v. 8 -	- 488
i. 21 -	- 335	v. 17 -	- 500
i. 24 -	135, 259	v. 19, 20 -	- 368
i. 24, 25 -	- 226	2 Thessalonians	
i. 25-27 -	- 241	iii. 10 -	- 361
i. 26 -	- 232	iii. 17, 18 -	- 509
i. 27 -	105, 236	1 Timothy	
i. 29 -	- 238	ii. 1, 2 -	- 499
ii. 7 -	- 268	iii. 16 -	- 408
ii. 8 -	- 399	vi. 1, 2 -	- 474
ii. 9 -	- 131	Titus	
ii. 12 -	- 153	iii. 3-7 -	- 155
ii. 13 -	- 138	iii. 5 -	- 443
ii. 14 -	- 191	Philemon	
ii. 19 -	- 918	4-6 -	- 90
iii. 1 -	- 153	25 -	- 510
iii. 5 -	- 394	Hebrews	
iii. 8 -	- 369	i. 1 -	- 69
iii. 9 -	- 345	iv. 12 -	- 493
iii. 12 -	- 288	iv. 14 -	- 306
iii. 12, 13	- 372	vii. 26 -	- 306
iii. 13 -	- 385	xiii. 12 -	- 441
iii. 13-15	- 292	James	
iii. 15 -	392, 424	i. 17 -	- 94
iii. 15-17	- 424	1 Peter	
iii. 18 -	- 432	i. 12 -	- 252
iii. 19 -	- 439	i. 20 -	- 54
iii. 20, 21	- 460	ii. 5 -	- 220
iii. 20-iv. 1.	- 468	ii. 18-21 -	- 473
iv. 2-4 -	- 501	iii. 1-7 -	- 454
iv. 6 -	- 366	iii. 18 -	200, 256
iv. 7-9 -	- 503	iii. 18, 19	- 306
iv. 18 -	- 510	iv. 9-11 -	- 299
1 Thessalonians		v. 8 -	- 482
ii. 3, 4 -	- 471	1 John	
ii. 12 -	- 286	iv. 20 -	- 87

Some Press Notices.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF ISAIAH

4s. 6d. net. BURNS AND OATES.

The Oxford and Cambridge Review.—"Dr. Hitchcock's work seems to us to be, though short, nevertheless, of prime importance. It is a reasoned attack by a Hebraist of the most competent erudition on an elementary position of the Higher Critics—the position that the 'Book of the Prophet Isaiah' is in reality a composite, and in considerable part a late, production. Dr. Hitchcock actually champions the *prima facie* Christian view that the Book is what it professes to be. And what is more, he presents such a case that we strongly urge our readers to get his volume and study it. To be sure, it is impossible, without a knowledge, and a good knowledge, of Hebrew, to follow his argument in its entirety: but he has been obviously and laudably careful so to write that any man with a classical training can grasp the main gist even of his more abstruse discussions; and in order to understand to the full his broad lines of proof, no Hebrew at all is necessary. How long is the real defence of Holy Writ to be left almost entirely to the Roman Church?"

The Tablet.—"It is a revelation of accuracy, of thoroughness, of moderation."

The Catholic Times.—"The work manifests the qualities demanded by such a weighty discussion, soberness, patience, thoroughness and erudition, relieved occasionally with a gleam of quiet humour."

THE FIRST TWELVE CHAPTERS OF
ISAIAH

3s. 6d. net. BURNS AND OATES.

The Publishers' Circular.—The author's "great erudition and wide knowledge of recent discovery make his book one of immense value to all who wish to study the original text of Isaiah's great hymn of warning and hope."

The Universe.—"Whether one considers the new translation of the prophet given in these pages, or the lucid commentary, evidently the fruit of original research, it is impossible not to feel proud, as a Catholic, that the clergy can make so brave a show and hold their own so well in the field of Bible exegetics and legitimate Higher Criticism."

The Irish Rosary.—"For many years there has been no new work on the first part of Isaiah comparable to that which has just been published by Father Hitchcock. It is by far the most learned commentary with which we are acquainted, and we have no hesitation in putting it above the excellent ones by Knabenbauer and Trochon."

The Month.—"Dr. Hitchcock's methods and the colour of his conclusions are familiar by now to Catholic students. Nor can anyone have a word to say against the most conservative decision if it be but supported with scientific reasoning. And no one can possibly deny to the author a really most remarkable erudition, combined with an exceptional charm, and indeed poetry, of expression and illustration. . . . Were all our books written with the kindly feeling, the artistic sense, and the laborious foundation of this one, more would listen to us, and the 'enlargement of the kingdom would be hastened' (p. vii.)."

The Irish Independent.—"It is a masterly work, and will repay the student's deepest attention, nor will the finished scholar find his time wasted if he peruses every line."

The Tablet.—"Dr. Hitchcock is conservative in his views; he accepts the Emmanuel prophecy in its most explicit sense. At the same time—and this is the value of the book—he labours with a patient exactness that gives his students confidence. He knows what others have said, and estimates their evidence at its full worth; but also he lets us feel, what after all we are learning from many other sources, that this evidence is not so conclusive as but a few years ago we were commonly told. In addition, Dr. Hitchcock succeeds in bringing home the characteristics of Isaiah. He watches the history, and points out how the prophet breaks in upon it—the method, since Ewald, accepted as affording the key to the fullest understanding of the prophetic books."

SERMON DELIVERY

2s. 6d. net. BURNS AND OATES.

The Guardian.—"Lack of training in elocution is perhaps the most obvious and common fault of the clergy of the English Church. To them, therefore, as well as to students, this book, by a Roman Catholic writer, may be commended. It is a useful series of graduated exercises both with regard to voice-production and suitable gesture."

THE SONGS OF A CONVERT

Mr. Shane Leslie in the *Irish Rosary*.—"These songs "would, in our opinion, have achieved the conversion of Hurrell Froude, called the Knight-Errant of the Oxford

Movement, whose fate it was to die upon the threshold, but to come no further. At the same time, Father Hitchcock has written themes that would hardly have been set in such glowing verse in those far days before the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception had been proclaimed, or the whole world dedicated to the Sacred Heart, those two great events which have since coloured the prayers of the entire Catholic world."

A PILGRIM OF ETERNITY

The Story of a Unitarian Minister.

1s. 6d. CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY.

The Month.—"A profound analysis of religious thought outside the Church."

The Irish Rosary.—"Catholic essayists and preachers will find in it many a noble thought nobly expressed."

SERMON COMPOSITION

2s. 6d. net. BURNS AND OATES.

The object of this book is to show that the various schemes, proposed by great masters of rhetoric and meditation, may be reduced to one simple form, which is easily learned and very helpful both in sermon preparation and in extempore speaking.

BURNS & OATES' PUBLICATIONS

A SELECTION, CHIEFLY
OF DEVOTIONAL WORKS

*The new Complete Catalogue
of 200 pages, including
Foreign Books, post
free on appli-
cation*

	PAGE
SPIRITUAL READING - - - -	3
THE BLESSED SACRAMENT - - -	7
THE BLESSED VIRGIN - - - -	11
THEOLOGICAL AND APOLOGETICAL	13
SERMONS AND DISCOURSES - -	15
BIBLES AND PRAYER BOOKS - -	16
FOR PRIESTS AND RELIGIOUS - -	18
BIOGRAPHY AND HAGIOLOGY - -	19
MISCELLANEOUS - - - - -	22

*Threepence in the Shilling off all Books, except
NET Books, for Cash with order*

28 ORCHARD STREET
LONDON

Telegrams
Burns Oates
London

W

Telephones
5911 Mayfair
2706 Mayfair

THE NEW ROMAN MISSAL

SECOND EDITION, upon
opaque paper, NOW READY

MESSRS. BURNS & OATES' ROMAN MISSAL published at the end of 1912, achieved an immediate and enormous sale, and the first large impression was almost immediately exhausted. A second edition is now ready, *printed upon perfectly opaque paper*, and the Publishers believe this to be one of the most beautiful of modern books for its perfect typography, its size, its shape and the beauty afforded by the use of red ink for the rubrics throughout. A copy will be gladly sent on approval where desired.

The Contents :

A COMPLETE English translation of the Missal, together with the Latin of the entire Ordinary and Canon, and of all other portions of the Mass which should be sung by the choir.

¶ The best translation—Bishop Challoner's—revised.

¶ A note by Father Hetherington, of Westminster Cathedral, explaining the proper use of the Missal in view of the recent reforms, which are all incorporated.

The Form :

THE neatest English-Latin Missal published. It is a *pocket* Missal. The type is beautiful, clear and bold, and the paper is perfectly opaque.

¶ The only Missal printed throughout in red and black. This makes for a delightful ease of reference and reading, and greatly enhances the beauty of a well-designed page.

The Bindings :

WITH all the usual Supplements. Cloth, round corners, red or gilt edges, 5s. net. Smooth roan, limp, red or gilt edges, Rutland roan gilt, red under gold edges, 7s. 6d. net. English calf boards, red edges, 8s. 6d. net. Limp morocco, gilt, red under gold edges, 10s. 6d. net. German calf, gilt, red under gold edges, 10s. 6d. net. And in even finer styles, up to 30s. net.

BURNS & OATES' PUBLICATIONS

A SELECTION, CHIEFLY
OF DEVOTIONAL WORKS

All Books are bound in cloth unless otherwise stated.

3

À KEMPIS, THOMAS

Of the Imitation of Christ. *The Seraphic Edition*; an entirely new translation from the Latin by FATHER THADDEUS, O.F.M. Very finely printed in red and black. Cloth, 6/- net; leather, 7/6 net (postage 4d.). *Popular Edition*, 6d. net (postage 2d.), and 1/-. *Superfine Pocket Edition*, from 1/6 to 10/-. *Presentation Edition*, from 3/6 to 15/-. *Latin, French, Italian and Spanish Editions* in stock.

Spiritual
Reading

AT THE FEET OF JESUS. By MADAME
CECILIA. 2/6.

DEVOTIONAL LIBRARY FOR CATHOLIC
HOUSEHOLDS. Containing: New Testa-
ment, Book of Psalms, Imitation of Christ,
Devout Life, Spiritual Combat. Cloth, red
edges, with cloth case to match. 5/- net
(postage 4d.).

DEVOTION TO THE NINE CHOIRS OF
HOLY ANGELS. Translated from the French
of Borendon by E. HEALY THOMPSON. 2/6 net
(postage 3d.).

DOLOROUS PASSION OF OUR LORD
JESUS CHRIST. From the Meditations of
ANNE CATHERINE EMMERICH. 3/6.

FATHER DIGNAM'S CONFERENCES, with
Retreats, Sermons, and Notes of Spiritual
Direction. By Miss TAYLOR (Mother Magdalen,
S.M.G.) With a Preface by Cardinal Mazzella,
S.J. 6/- net. (postage 4d.)

FATHER DIGNAM'S RETREATS. 6/- net.
(postage 4d.).

*Spiritual
Reading
(contd.)*

FATHER FABER.

All for Jesus: or, The Easy Ways of Divine Love. 5/-.

Bethlehem. 7/-.

Growth in Holiness: or, The Progress of the Spiritual Life. 6/-.

Notes on Doctrinal and Spiritual Subjects. Two Vols. 10/-.

Spiritual Conferences. 6/-.

The Creator and the Creature: or, The Wonders of Divine Love. 6/-.

The Precious Blood: or, The Price of our Salvation. 5/-.

FEASTS FOR THE FAITHFUL. Cloth 1/- net (postage 2d.). Translated by special permission of the Holy See from the *Greater Catechism*. It contains Instructions on all the chief Feasts of the Year.

Just the thing for those who desire to enter into the spirit with which the Church observes the various periods of the ecclesiastical year.—*Month*.

FEASTS OF MOTHER CHURCH (THE). With Hints and Helps for the Holier Keeping of them. By MOTHER M. SALOME. Illustrated. 3/6.

The writer goes through the ecclesiastical year, and in a pleasant, instructive, and stimulating style impresses upon the reader the lessons they suggest. Thoughts are drawn from the Scriptures, the liturgy, the lives of the Saints, and other sources, all being woven into a charming spiritual bouquet.—

Catholic Times.

FRANCIS DE SALES, ST.

Introduction to the Devout Life. Cloth, red edges, 1/6. Calf, red edges, 5s. Morocco, gilt edges, 5/6.

The Mystical Explanation of the Cantic of Canticles. Also St. Jane Frances de Chantal's Depositions in the Cause of the Beatification and Canonization of St. Francis de Sales. 6/-.

Spiritual Conferences of St. Francis de Sales. Translated, with Additions and Notes, under the supervision of ABBOT GASQUET, O.S.B., and the late CANON MACKEY, O.S.B. 6/-.

Letters to Persons in the World. 6/-.

The Treatise on the Love of God. 6/-.

Spiritual
Reading
(contd).

FRANCIS DE SALES, THE SPIRIT OF ST.
By JEAN PIERRE CAMUS, Bishop of Belley. With
a Preface by His Grace the Archbishop of
Westminster. Cr. 8vo., cloth, 6/-.

**GERTRUDE AND MECHTILDE, THE
PRAYERS OF SS.** Cloth, 1/- Leather, 2/-
and 4/6.

GERTRUDE, THE EXERCISES OF ST.
Cloth, 1/6. Leather, 2/- and 4/6.

**GROWTH IN THE KNOWLEDGE OF OUR
LORD.** Meditations for every Day of the Year.
Adapted from the Original of the Abbé de
Brandt. By MOTHER MARY FIDELIS. In
Three Volumes. 21/- net (postage 7d.).

*Messrs. Burns & Oates have just entirely re-set
this modern classic of devotion, and it has been
thoroughly revised by the Translator.*

HEAVENWARDS. By MOTHER MARY LOYOLA.
Edited by FR. THURSTON, S.J. A chapter
for every week of the year. Illustrated. 3/6 net
(postage 4d.).

What seems specially recommendable in these pages is
the cheerful encouragement offered to all to look steadily
forward to the goal of human life.

HOLY WISDOM. (*Sancta Sophia*). Directions for
the Prayer of Contemplation, &c. By VEN.
FATHER F. AUGUSTIN BAKER, O. S. B. Edited
by ABBOT SWEENEY, D.D. Quarter leather,
5/- *Cheaper*, 3/6.

I AM THE WAY. By FATHER NEPVEU, S.J.
With a Preface by the Archbishop of West-
minster. 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

**IMITATION OF THE SACRED HEART OF
JESUS.** In Four Books. By Rev. FATHER
ARNOLD, S.J. Cloth, 4/6. Leather, 8/6.

*Spiritual
Reading
(contd.)*

LEAVES FROM ST. AUGUSTINE. By MARY ALLIES. Third Edition. 6/- net (postage 5d.).

MEDITATIONS ON THE SACRED HEART. By the Rev. JOSEPH EGGER, S.J. Cloth, gilt. 2/6.

MEMENTOES OF THE ENGLISH MARTYRS AND CONFESSORS for every day of the year. By FATHER H. SEBASTIAN BOWDEN, of the Oratory. 1/- net (postage 2d.).

PATERNOSTER, ST. TERESA'S. A Treatise on Prayer. By Very Rev. JOSEPH FRASSINETTI. 4/-.

RETREAT MANUAL, THE. A Handbook for the Annual Retreat and Monthly Recollection. By MADAME CECILIA. Preface by the Rev. Sidney Smith, S.J. 2/- Leather, 3/6.

SACRED HEART, PROMISES OF THE. Commentary and Meditations, by the Rev. JOSEPH McDONNELL, S.J. With frontispiece, handsomely bound and printed, cloth gilt, 2/6 net (postage 3d.). *Just published.*

SCUPOLI'S SPIRITUAL COMBAT. With the Supplement and the Treatise on Inward Peace. Size, 5 by 3¼ inches. Cloth, 6d. net (postage 2d.). Cloth, gilt, red edges, 1/- Lambskin, 2/6. Calf and Morocco, 4/6.

SPIRIT OF THE CURÉ D'ARS, THE. From the French of M. l'ABBÉ MONNIN. Edited by Rev. JOHN E. BOWDEN, of the Oratory. With Portrait. 2/-.

SPIRITUAL ASCENT, THE. A Devotional Treatise by GERARD OF ZUTPHEN. 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

SPIRITUAL PERFECTION. By REV. REGINALD BUCKLER, O.P. 5/-.

SPIRITUAL RETREAT. By Rev. REGINALD BUCKLER, O.P. 3/6 net (postage 4d.).

STATIONS OF THE CROSS. By HERBERT THURSTON, S.J. 3/6 net (postage 4d.).

TOWARDS ETERNITY. By the ABBÉ POULIN. Translated by M. T. TORROMÉ. 5/-.

ULLATHORNE, ARCHBISHOP.

Christian Patience, the Strength and Discipline of the Soul. 7/-.

The Endowments of Man considered in their Relations with his Final End. 7/-.

The Groundwork of the Christian Virtues. 7/-

The Little Book of Humility and Patience. Being a Selection from Archbishop Ullathorne's two volumes. With a Portrait. 2/- net (postage 2d.).

WATERS THAT GO SOFTLY : or, Thoughts for time of Retreat. By FR. RICKABY, S.J. 2/6.

WISEMAN, CARDINAL.

A Month's Meditations. Leather back. 4/-.

Meditations on the Sacred Passion of Our Lord 4/-.

Meditations on the Incarnation and Life of Our Lord. 4/-.

AT HOME NEAR THE ALTAR. By Rev. MATTHEW RUSSELL, S. J. Cloth, gilt. 1/- net (postage 1½d.).

BANQUET OF THE ANGELS, THE. Preparation and Thanksgiving for Holy Communion. By ARCHBISHOP PORTER, S.J. Blue Cloth, gilt, 2/-.

CHILDREN'S CHARTER, THE. Being talks to Parents and Teachers on the Preparation of Children for their First Communion. By MOTHER MARY LOYOLA. Cloth, 2/- net (postage 2d.).

This valuable work is a direct response to the Holy Father's "Decree on the Age of First Communicants." All who are responsible for the proper instruction of very young First Communicants can in no way afford to be without this work. It has been enthusiastically praised by Cardinal Logue, the Archbishop of Westminster, Bishop Hedley, and the Catholic Clergy, Laity, and Press.

*Spiritual
Reading
(contd.)*

*The
Blessed
Sacra-
ment*

*The
Blessed
Sacra-
ment
(contd.)*

CLOSE TO THE ALTAR RAILS. By the Rev. MATTHEW RUSSELL, S.J. Cloth, gilt. 1/- net (postage 1½d.).

Father Russell has great gifts as a littérateur, and "Close to the Altar Rails" is as instinct as his former works with those poetically devotional graces which render the reading of his compositions as much a delight as an instruction.—*Tablet.*

COMMUNION DAY. Fervorinos, Before and After. By Father MATTHEW RUSSELL, S.J. 3rd Edition. 1/6 net (postage 2d.).

DEVOTIONS FOR HOLY COMMUNION. With Preface by FATHER ALBAN GOODIER, S.J. Finely Printed. Cloth, 3/6 net. Leather, 5/- net (postage 3d.).

This book contains a rich variety of such prayers and devotions to our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament as are most approved, whether by their authorship, or by the direct authority of the Church, or by long use of the faithful. The collection has been drawn almost exclusively from the Holy Scriptures, from the Missal and Breviary, from the writings of Saints and Fathers, from the Paradisus Animae, and from "The Following of Christ."

DIVINE CONSOLER, THE. Little Visits to the Most Holy Sacrament. By J. M. ANGÉLI, of the Lazarist Fathers. Translated by GENEVIÈVE IRONS. *New edition.* 1/6.

FABER, FATHER.

The Blessed Sacrament: or, the Works and Ways of God. 7/6.

Contents: Prologue—On Triumph—The Blessed Sacrament, The Greatest Work of God—The Blessed Sacrament, the Devotion of Catholics—The Blessed Sacrament, a Picture of God—The Blessed Sacrament, a Picture of Jesus—Epilogue—On Reparation.

FIRST COMMUNION. A Book of Preparation for First Communion. By MOTHER MARY LOYOLA. Edited by FATHER THURSTON, S.J. New and Revised Edition, re-set in clear type with several new illustrations. 3/6.

FIRST COMMUNION, QUESTIONS ON. By MOTHER M. LOYOLA. 1/-.

HE IS CALLING ME. By Father MATTHEW RUSSELL, S.J. (*This was Fr. Russell's last Eucharistic book*). Cloth gilt, 2s. 6d. net (postage 3d.)

A multitude of tender thoughts, of urgent prayers, of meditations sweet and sorrowful, lie gathered in these sheaves, for our spirit's nurture and for our heart's delight. We forget the page and print (nice as they are!) we are unaware of the medium, but we hear the message, direct, untroubled, tender, clear.—*Tablet*.

HISTORY OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST IN GREAT BRITAIN. By T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R. Edited with Notes by FATHER THURSTON, S.J. Illustrated. Folio, strongly bound. An acknowledged masterpiece of printing, uniform with "OF GOD AND HIS CREATURES." 21/- net (postage 7d.).

No work . . . from its singular combination of earnest piety and wide historical knowledge, is better fitted to represent the contribution of Great Britain and Ireland to the Eucharistic Literature of the world.—*Herbert Thurston, S.J.*

HOLY COMMUNION. By Mgr. DE GIBERQUES, Bishop of Valence. Cloth gilt, with frontispiece, 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

A remarkable book of good counsel and exhortation and instruction, which has stirred the hearts of Catholic France. *Just published.*

HOLY COMMUNION, THE. By JOHN BERNARD DALGAIRNS, of the Oratory. Two vols., 7/- net (postage 5d.).

A new edition of the standard explanation of the Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist.

HOLY SACRIFICE AND ITS CEREMONIES, THE. By FATHER NIEUWBARN, O.P. This book has been selling by thousands in Dutch. Now issued in English, with Illustrations, 2/-.

JESUS IS WAITING. Appeals and Reproaches from the Prisoner of Love. By FATHER MATTHEW RUSSELL, S.J. Cloth, 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

JESUS, THE BREAD OF CHILDREN. Chats with FATHER CYRIL about First Communion. By FATHER DE ZULUETA, S.J. With five Illustrations, 6d. net. Cloth 1s. net (postage 2d.).

This book, which has achieved a remarkable success, supplies the want of the young First Communicants themselves, as Mother Loyola's "The Children's Charter" satisfies the necessities of the Instructor.

*The
Blessed
Sacra-
ment
(contd.)*

*The
Blessed
Sacra-
ment
(contd.)*

MANNING, CARDINAL.

The Blessed Sacrament the Centre of Immutable Truth. Cloth, gilt. 1/-.

MOMENTS BEFORE THE TABERNACLE.

By Rev. MATTHEW RUSSELL, S.J. 1/- net (postage 1d.).

A series of reflections touchingly beautiful.—*Ave Maria*.

REFLECTIONS AND PRAYERS FOR HOLY COMMUNION.

Translated from the French. With Preface by Cardinal MANNING. In 2 Vols., each complete in itself. Cloth, 4/6 each; English calf, boards, red edges, 9/- each; Turkey morocco, limp, round corners, gilt edges, 10/- each.

These simple and beautiful pages can hardly fail to replenish our minds with thoughts and reflections which will return upon us as our own in the presence of Our Divine Master.—*Cardinal Manning*.

SACRIFICE OF THE MASS, THE.

An Explanation of its Doctrine, Rubrics, and Prayers. By Rev. M. GAVIN, S.J. 2/-.

TREASURE OF THE CHURCH, THE.

By CANON J. B. BAGSHAW, D.D. 3/6.

VISITS TO THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT AND THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

By ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. Edited by BISHOP COFFIN, C.S.S.R. Cloth, 1/- . Leather, 2/6 and 4/6.

WELCOME! HOLY COMMUNION, BEFORE AND AFTER.

By MOTHER MARY LOYOLA. 3/6 net. Prayer-book size, leather, 5/- net (postage 4d.). Even finer bindings for presentation up to 10/6 net.

Of all Mother Loyola's works this has obtained for itself the greatest affection, fame, and popularity.

Is not a collection of prayers in the ordinary sense; there is nothing artificial about it, and not its least merit is its extreme naturalness. Rather does it *suggest* prayer, and prayer growing naturally out of such needs and burdens, or even moods, as most commonly fall to our lot. To those especially who communicate frequently the book will be a great boon.—*Tablet*.

ATTRIBUTES OF GOD, Mirrored in the Perfections of Mary. 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

BLESSED VIRGIN IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, THE. Apparitions, Revelations, Graces. By BERNARD ST. JOHN. With Introduction by Rev. E. Thiriet, O.M.I. Illustrated. 6/-.

CONVERT'S ROSARY, THE. By ALICE GARDINER. Cloth, gilt edges, 1/6 net (postage 2d.). *A simple, effective, and most pious method of reciting the Rosary, suitable for all clients of Our Lady, but especially for those who have newly found her.*

FABER, FATHER.

The Foot of the Cross : or, The Sorrows of Mary. 6/-.

Father Faber's May Book. Cloth, gilt edges. 2/-.

GLORIES OF MARY, THE. By ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. Edited by BISHOP COFFIN, C.S.S.R. 3/6.

GREATER EVE, THE. Six Essays on Mary's position in Catholic Theology. By the Rev. JOSEPH H. STEWART. 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

A new work that is admirably adapted to the needs of converts, as well as to Catholics born.

MADONNA, THE. A Pictorial Record of the Life and Death of the Mother of our Lord Jesus Christ by the Painters and Sculptors of Christendom in more than Five Hundred of their Works. The Text translated from the Italian of ADOLFO VENTURI, with an Introduction by ALICE MEYNELL. A new edition, 15/- net.

The *Academy* says—The book is wine that needs no bush. It is a deeply interesting collection of reproductions. The text is minute and learned, and the massing of reference and description managed with much skill. The book has, further, the advantage of an introduction by Mrs. Meynell, to which many will turn with more avidity than is usually excited by introductions.

MADONNA OF THE POETS, THE. An anthology of only the best poems in Our Lady's honour. With five reproductions after favourite Old Masters. New and cheaper edition, 1/6 net (postage 3d.).

*The
Blessed
Virgin
(contd).*

MARY IMMACULATE. From the Writings of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church as found in the Roman Breviary. Compiled by FATHER JOHN MARY, Capuchin Friar Minor. Cloth, 1/- net (postage 2d.). Leather, 2/6 net (postage 2d.)

MARY IN THE EPISTLES. By Rev. T. LIVIUS, M.A., C.S.S.R. 5/-.

MARY IN THE GOSPELS. Lectures on the History of Our Blessed Lady, as recorded by the Evangelists. By Very Rev. J. SPENCER NORTH-COTE. 3/6.

MONTH OF MARY. By HENRI LASSERRE. In thirty-one readings. 2/6.

MONTH OF MARY. By ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. 1/6.

MONTH OF MARY. By FATHER MUZZARELLI, S.J. 1s.

OUR LADY'S MANUAL: or, Devotions to the Sacred Heart of Mary. Cloth, 2/-. Best Cloth, red edges, 2/6. Calf or Morocco, 5/6 each.

OUR LADY OF PERPETUAL SUCCOUR. A Manual of Devotion for every day of the Month. Translated from the French by Rev. T. LIVIUS, C.S.S.R. Cloth, 1/- net. Leather, 4/6 net (postage 2d.).

OUR LADY OF PERPETUAL SUCCOUR, MANUAL OF. From the Writings of St. Alphonsus Liguori. By a Redemptorist Father. 1/- and 2/- net. With hymns, 1/6 and 3/- net (postage 3d.).

SINLESS MARY AND SINFUL MARY.
I.—Mary's Social Mission as the Second Eve.
II.—The Woman that was a Sinner. By FATHER BERNARD VAUGHAN, S.J. With Two Illustrations. Stiff wrapper, 1/- net (postage 2d.).

TREATISE ON THE TRUE DEVOTION TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY. By Blessed GRIGNON DE MONTFORT. 2/-.

Edited by CARDINAL VAUGHAN, who says: "I should be glad to see it in the hands of every priest, as experience has taught me the power of this most persuasive treatise in propagating a solid devotion to the Blessed Mother of God."

WORLD'S MADONNA, THE. A History of Our Lady. By J. S. MULHOLLAND, B.L. 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

*The
Blessed
Virgin
(contd.)*

CATHOLIC CONTROVERSY. A Reply to Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons." By Very Rev. H. I. D. RYDER, of the Oratory. 1/- net (postage 3d.).

CATHOLIC CONTROVERSY, THE. By ST. FRANCIS DE SALES. Edited by Very Rev. CANON MACKAY, O.S.B. 6/-.

CONTROVERSIAL CATECHISM. By the Rev. STEPHEN KEENAN. 2/-.

FAITH AND FOLLY. By MGR. JOHN S. VAUGHAN. 5/- net. (postage 4d.).

FIRST TWELVE CHAPTERS OF ISAIAH, THE. A new Translation and Commentary. By Father GEORGE HITCHCOCK, D.D. 3/6 net (postage 4d.).

A theological masterpiece.—*Irish Independent.*

FORMATION OF CHRISTENDOM, THE. By T. W. ALLIES, K.C.S.G. *New and Revised Edition.* 5/- each volume.

Vol. I. The Christian Faith and the Individual.—Vol. II. The Christian Faith and Society.—Vol. III. The Christian Faith and Philosophy.—Vol. IV. As seen in Church and State.—Vol. V. The Throne of the Fisherman.

FREE WILL AND FOUR ENGLISH PHILOSOPHERS. A Study of Hobbes, Locke, Hume and Mill. By FATHER JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. 3/6 net (postage 3d.).

FURTHER NOTES ON ST. PAUL. A new volume in the Quarterly Series. By Father JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J., 3/6 net (postage 4d.).

*Theo-
logical
and
Apolo-
getical*

*Theo-
logical
and
Apolo-
getical
(contd.)*

MANNING, CARDINAL.

Sin and its Consequences. 4/-.

The Glories of the Sacred Heart. 4/-.

The Four Great Evils of the Day. 2/6.

The Fourfold Sovereignty of God. 2/6.

The Holy Ghost the Sanctifier. Cloth, gilt. 2/-.

The Independence of the Holy See. 2/6.

The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost: or,
Reason and Revelation. Cr. 8vo. 5/-.

The Workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church
of England. 1/6.

Why I became a Catholic. (Religio Viatoris).
1/-.

NATURAL RELIGION. Being Vol. I. of Dr.
HETTINGER'S "Evidences of Christianity." Edited
by Rev. H. S. BOWDEN. With an Introduction
on "Certainty." 7/6.

OF GOD AND HIS CREATURES. By Father
JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. An Annotated translation,
of the "Summa Contra Gentiles" of St. Thomas
Aquinas. Foolsap folio, strongly bound. An
acknowledged masterpiece of the printers' art.
21/- net (postage 7d.). Uniform with the
"HISTORY OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST IN GREAT
BRITAIN."

This minor masterpiece of the great Dominican Doctor of
the Church, now for the first time translated into English, is
elucidated in the light of modern learning by the comments of
the Jesuit translator. These Notes have placed Father
Rickaby in the first rank of annotators; and the handsome
folio page admits by its size the printing of them in direct
contact with the text to which they refer. Thus is a profound
treatise brought, for the most part, within the apprehension of
the simplest reader.

PETER, ST., BISHOP OF ROME: or, the Roman
Episcopate of the Prince of the Apostles. By
Rev. T. LIVIUS, M.A., C.S.S.R. 12/-.

RELIGION OF THE PLAIN MAN. By Mgr.
R. H. BENSON. With a Portrait of the Author.
2/6 net (postage 3d.).

REVEALED RELIGION. The Second Volume of Dr. HETTINGER's "Evidences of Christianity." Edited by Rev. H. S. BOWDEN. With an Introduction on the "Assent of Faith." 5/-.

SUPLIANT OF THE HOLY GHOST: A Paraphrase of the "Veni Sancte Spiritus." By Rev. R. JOHNSON, of Louvain. Edited by Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R. 1/6.

WAYFARER'S VISION, THE. By FATHER GERRARD. 5/- net (postage 4d.).

Theological and Apologetical (contd.)

HEDLEY, BISHOP, O.S.B.

Christian Inheritance, The. Set forth in Sermons. 6/-.

Light of Life, The. Set forth in Sermons. 6/-.

Our Divine Saviour. 6/-.

A distinct and noteworthy feature of these sermons is their freshness—everywhere it is the heart of the preacher pouring out to his flock his own deep convictions, enforcing them from the "treasures, old and new," of a cultivated mind.—*Dublin Review*.

Sermons and Discourses

MANNING, CARDINAL.

Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects. 6/-.

SERMON COMPOSITION. A Method for Students. By Rev. GEORGE S. HITCHCOCK, B.A., Lond., Minerva University, Rome. With a Preface by the Rev. Bernard Vaughan, S.J. 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

SERMON DELIVERY. By the same Author. 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

SERMONS FOR THE SUNDAYS AND FESTIVALS OF THE YEAR. By ABBOTT SWEENEY, O.S.B. 7th Edition. Handsomely bound in quarter leather. 7/6.

We can assure such priests as are in search of matter to aid them in their round of Sunday discourses, and have not read this volume, that they will find in these 600 pages a mine of solid and simple Catholic teaching.—*Tablet*.

*Bibles
and
Prayer
Books*

Kindly write for Illustrated Prayer Book Catalogue.

THE BOOK OF BIBLE PRAYERS AND MEDITATIONS. A new work, composed of suitably arranged quotations from the Sacred Writings. In two volumes : the first of Prayers, containing Devotions and Preparation for Holy Communion, &c., and the second of Meditations. Favoured by a Brief from His Holiness Pope Pius X. Cloth, 1/- net each volume ; or the two bound together, 400 pages, 2/- net. Leather, 2/6 net each volume ; or bound together, 4/- net (postage, single volume 2d., double volume 3d.).

CATHOLIC'S DAILY COMPANION. 1/- to 5/-.

CATHOLIC'S VADE MECUM. 3/6 to 21/-.

DAILY PRAYER BOOK, THE. Leather. 2/- net (postage 3d.)

FLOWERS OF DEVOTION. *New Vest-pocket Edition.* With Ordinary of the Mass in large type, and Epistles and Gospels. In leather bindings at 1/-, 1/6, 2/-, 2/6, 4/-, 5/-, and 6/-

GARDEN OF THE SOUL. In seven different editions (including an entirely new one, rubricated, on India paper) and innumerable bindings. From 6d. to 17/6.

GOLDEN MANUAL, THE. The most complete Prayer Book. 900 pages. 6/- to 30/-.

HOLY BIBLE. *Octavo Edition* (9 by 6 inches). Cloth, red edges, 5/- ; and in a great variety of Leather Bindings, at 8/-, 10/-, 15/-, 18/-, 30/-, and 35/- each. *Pocket Edition* (size 5½ by 3½ inches) : Embossed Cloth, red edges, 2/6 ; and in Leather Bindings at 4/6, 6/6 and 7/6.

KEY OF HEAVEN. In five different editions (including an entirely new one on India paper with red rules round each page) and a great variety of bindings. 6d. to 17/6.

LATIN MISSALS for private use. *Tournai*, 48mo, 4/6 ; 16mo, 5/9, 6/9, 8/- ; 12mo, 9/9, 11/-, 15/- ; 8vo, 18/-, 23/-. *Ratisbon*, 16mo, 7/6 to 11/- ; 8vo, 12/6 to 17/6. *Mechlin*, 12mo, 10/6 to 12/6 ; 8vo, 16/-. All prices net. All Missals with

English Supplements. S.J. and Benedictine Supplements also in stock.

LITTLE CHILDREN'S PRAYER BOOK, THE.

With Instruction, Preparation, and Devotions for Confession and Holy Communion suitable for the very young. By MOTHER LOYOLA. With nine illustrations. Wrappers, 6d. net (postage 1d.); Cloth, 1s. net. Better paper and binding, 2/6 net (postage 2d.); also in even finer styles for First Communion presents.

MANUAL OF CATHOLIC PIETY. In Three Editions. 6d. net to 5/-.

MANUAL OF PRAYERS FOR CONGREGATIONAL USE. *New Pocket Edition* with Epistles and Gospels. (5 by 3¼ inches). 369 pages. Cloth, 6d. net (postage 2d.). Or with an Enlarged Appendix, Cloth, 1/- . Leather, 2/6, 5/-, & upwards.

MANUAL OF THE SACRED HEART. Cloth, 2/- . Cloth, red edges, with Frontispiece, 2/6. Leather, 4/6, 5/6, and 6/-.

MISSAL FOR THE LAITY. 6d. net to 5/-.

NEW TESTAMENT. *Large-Type Edition.* With annotations, references, and an historical and chronological index. Cr. 8vo (size 7½ by 5 inches.) 500 pp. Cloth, 2/- ; and in leather bindings at 4/6 and 8/6. *Pocket Edition :* Limp cloth, 6d. net (postage 2d.) ; Cloth, red edges, 1/- ; Leather bindings, 1/6, 3/- and 4/6. *Special India Paper Edition :* Limp Calf, 5/6 net ; Limp Morocco, 5/6 net (postage 2d.).

PARADISE OF THE CHRISTIAN SOUL, THE.

A beautiful reprint has just been issued by Messrs. Burns & Oates, of this unique collection of beautiful prayers. A copy will be sent on approval on request. An entirely new edition, printed in bold type upon opaque India paper, 840 pages, 5¼ × 3¼ × ⅝ in., with red rule round each page. Cloth, gilt or red edges, 5/- net. Roan, gilt edges, 6/- net. Rutland, red under gold edges, 7/6 net. Calf boards, red edges, 8/6 net. Limp morocco, gilt, red under gold edges, 10/6 net. And in even finer bindings up to 30/- net (postage 4d.).

This classic of rare devotion is divided primarily into the following Seven Parts, one for each day of the week :

*Bibles
and
Prayer
Books
(contd.)*

*Bibles
and
Prayer
Books
(contd.)*

I. Of the Worship of the Most Holy Trinity.
II. Of the Honour and Veneration of the Saints.
III. Of Penance. IV. Exercises profitable for
the Pursuit of Virtues. V. How to Communicate,
and to Celebrate and Hear Mass Well. VI. Of
the Life and Passion of Our Lord. VII. Of the
Veneration of the Blessed Virgin, and Exercises
for a happy Death.

PATH TO HEAVEN. *New and Enlarged Edition.*
(Over 1,000 pages). 2/- to 8/6.

RACCOLTA, THE, or, Collection of Indulged
Prayers and Good Works. The only Edition in
English in accord with the present list of In-
dulgences. A New and Revised Edition, 1911.
4/6 net (postage 4d.). Calf Boards and Limp
Morocco, 8/6.

ROMAN MISSAL. For particulars of Messrs.
Burns & Oates' remarkable new edition see p. 2.

SPIRIT OF THE SACRED HEART. 3/6, 5/6,
8/6, & 12/6. 700 pages, printed in large clear type.

*For
Priests,
Relig-
ious,
Oblates,
&c.*

CATECHISM OF THE VOWS. By Rev. P.
COTEL, S.J. 1/-.

INWARD GOSPEL, THE. Some familiar dis-
courses addressed to Religious who follow the
Rules of St. Ignatius. By W. D. STRAPPINI, S.J.
2/6 net (postage 3d.)

LETTERS TO PERSONS IN RELIGION. By
ST. FRANCIS DE SALES. With Introduction by
Bishop Hedley. 6/-.

MANNING, CARDINAL. The Eternal Priesthood.
3/6.

PARISH PRIEST'S PRACTICAL MANUAL,
NEW. A Work useful also for other Ecclesi-
astics, especially for Confessors and for Preachers.
By Very Rev. JOSEPH FRASSINETTI. Translated
by ARCHDEACON HUTCH, D.D. 6/-.

**PRACTICAL MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY
DAY IN THE YEAR,** on the Life of Our
Lord Jesus Christ. Chiefly for the use of Re-
ligious. By a Father of the Society of Jesus.
In Two Volumes. Cloth. 9/-.

RELIGIOUS LIFE AND THE VOWS, THE.

A Treatise by MGR. CHARLES GAY, Bishop of Anthedon. 5/-.

RETREAT, A. By BISHOP HEDLEY, O.S.B. For the use of the Clergy, Religious and others. 6/-.

SALVATOR'S PRACTICAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR NEW CONFESSORS. Edited by FATHER ANTHONY BALLERINI, S.J., and Translated by ARCHDEACON HUTCH, D.D. 18mo. Cloth, gilt. 4/-.

SPIRITUAL INSTRUCTION ON RELIGIOUS LIFE. By the Rev. H. REGINALD BUCKLER, O.P. 3/6 net (postage 4d.).

THE YOUNG PRIEST: Conferences on the Apostolic Life. By HERBERT CARDINAL VAUGHAN. Edited by MGR. CANON J. S. VAUGHAN. 5/- net (postage 4d.).

*For
Priests,
Religious,
Oblates,
&c.*

ACTON, LORD, AND HIS CIRCLE. Edited by ABBOT GASQUET. With an Engraved Portrait of Lord Acton. 15/- net (postage 5d.).

ALLIES, THOMAS WILLIAM. A Biography. By his daughter, MARY ALLIES. With Two Portraits and other Illustrations. 3/6 net (postage 4d.).

ANSELM OF CANTERBURY, ST. By Right Rev. MGR. MOYES. 6d. net (postage 2d.).

BOURNE, CARDINAL. A Record of his Sayings and doings, with many hitherto unpublished portraits. Wrappers, 1s. net. Cloth, gilt, 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

BRIEF HISTORIE OF THE GLORIOUS MARTYRDOM OF XII PRIESTS, Edmund Campion and his Companions. By CARDINAL ALLEN. Edited by Rev. J. H. POLLEN, S.J. 4/- net (postage 4d.).

BUTLER, REV. ALBAN.

Complete Lives of the Saints for Every Day in the Year. Twelve Pocket Monthly Volumes and Index Volume, in neat cloth binding, gilt lettered, 1/6 each. Or the complete set of Thirteen Volumes, in handsome cloth case, 20/-.

*Bio-
graphy
and
Hagi-
ology*

Bio-
graphy
and
Hagi-
ology
(contd.)

CAMPION, EDMUND, LIFE OF. By RICHARD SIMPSON. 12/-

CATHERINE DE RICCI, ST.: HER LIFE, HER LETTERS, HER COMMUNITY. By F. M. CAPES. Introduced by a Treatise on the Mystical Life by Father Bertrand Wilberforce, O.P. With a Portrait of the Saint, a Facsimile Letter, and other Illustrations. 7/6 net (postage 5d.).

CURÉ D'ARS, LIFE OF THE. From the French of ABBÉ MONNIN. Edited by CARDINAL MANNING. F'cap 8vo. Illustrated wrapper. 1/- net. Cloth, gilt. 2/6 net (postage 4d.).

DOMINICAN MARTYRS OF GREAT BRITAIN. By Father RAYMUND DEVAS, O.P. 2/- net (postage 2d.).

GERTRUDE, ST., LIFE AND REVELATIONS OF. By the Author of "St. Francis and the Franciscans." 7/6.

IGNATIUS, THE LIFE OF SAINT. By FRANCIS THOMPSON. With over 100 Illustrations. 10/6 net (postage 6d.).

The character of St. Ignatius appears with a clearness and a force that have never graced it before in English or, we may venture to say, in any other tongue.—*Month*.

The most masterly presentation of the life of a Saint that our age has seen.—*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*.

JOAN THE MAID, BLESSED. By Mgr. A. S. BARNES, M.A. Wrapper, 1/- net; cloth, 2/6 net (postage 2d.).

JOHN BAPTIST DE ROSSI, ST. Translated from the Italian by LADY HERBERT. A new edition, with an Introduction on Ecclesiastical Training and the Sacerdotal Life, by Cardinal Vaughan. 5/- net (postage 4d.).

JOHN EUDES, LIFE OF THE BLESSED. By FATHER MATHEW RUSSELL, S.J. Cloth, 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

JOSEPH, LIFE AND GLORIES OF ST. By E. HEALY THOMPSON, M.A. 6/-.

KIRK'S BIOGRAPHIES OF THE ENGLISH CATHOLICS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. Edited by FATHER POLLEN, S.J. 7/6 net (postage 4d.).

LIFE AND LABOURS OF SAINT JOHN BAPTIST DE LA SALLE. By FRANCIS THOMPSON. 2/5 net (postage 3d.).

The notable story of the sainted pioneer of modern educational methods.

LIFE OF CARDINAL VAUGHAN, THE. By J. G. SNEAD-COX. New cheap unabridged edition. Two Volumes. Demy 8vo, 10/- net (postage 6d.). Sixth Thousand.

The chapter on his "Inner Life" is a human document of intense interest: a revelation in character as beautiful as it is pathetic.—*Daily Chronicle*.

LITTLE FLOWER OF JESUS (Sœur Thérèse), COMPLETE LIFE, LETTERS, Etc., OF. Edited and translated with Prologue and Epilogue, by the Rev. T. N. TAYLOR. Demy 8vo, 448 pages, printed in red and black upon rag paper, with 14 illustrations in photogravure, handsome cloth, gilt, 6/- net (postage 5d.).

It contains a vast amount of new matter, and equals in appearance any Biography of four times its price. A masterpiece of editing and translation. The profits are devoted to the Cause of Beatification.

LITTLE FLOWER OF JESUS, THE. A free and charming translation of "L'Histoire d'une Ame" only. Three Portraits. 2/6 net (postage 4d.).

A Biography that has created a profound spiritual sensation throughout the world.

LITTLE FLOWER OF JESUS, CAUSE OF BEATIFICATION OF. The Official Argument, by Mgr. DE TEIL, Vice-postulator of the Cause. Cloth gilt, with Portrait in colours, 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

The account, full of interest, of the Little Flower's heroic virtues; a summary of her life, and the details of her innumerable miraculous cures, conversions, etc.

LUMMIS, MADAME ROSE. By DELIA GLEESON. 2/6 net. (postage 3d.).

LYDWINE OF SCHIEDAM, LIFE OF ST. A remarkable and little-known biography of the 14th century Virgin, by THOMAS A KEMPIS. Translation and Introduction by DOM VINCENT SCULLY, C.R.L. Very attractively printed and bound. 3/6 net (postage 4d.).

Bio-
graphy
and
Hagi-
ology
(contd.)

*Bio-
graphy
and*

*Hagi-
ology
(contd.)*

MINIATURE LIVES OF THE SAINTS, for every Day in the Year. Edited by Rev. H. S. BOWDEN of the Oratory. Two Vols. 4s.

MORE, LIFE AND WRITINGS OF BLESSED THOMAS. By FATHER BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R. 6/-.

PATRICK, APOSTLE OF IRELAND, LIFE OF ST. By Rev. W. B. MORRIS. 2/6.

PERONNE MARIE, A SPIRITUAL DAUGHTER OF ST. FRANCIS OF SALES. By a Religious of the Visitation. 3/6 net (postage 4d.).

SŒUR THÉRÈSE OF LISIEUX. See under "Little Flower," p. 21.

THOMAS AQUINAS, THE ANGELIC DOCTOR, LIFE OF ST. Edited by Rev. PIUS CAVANAGH, O.P. With eleven Illustrations. 4/6.

THOMAS OF AQUIN, LIFE AND LABOURS OF ST. By ARCHBISHOP VAUGHAN, O.S.B. Edited by DOM JEROME VAUGHAN, O.S.B. 6/6.

TWO LIVES OF OUR LORD FOR CHILDREN.

Jesus of Nazareth. By MOTHER M. LOYOLA. With many beautiful illustrations. 5/- net (postage 4d.).

The Life of Our Lord. Written for Little Ones. By MOTHER M. SALOME. 3/6.

WARD, MARY: A Foundress of the Seventeenth Century. By MOTHER M. SALOME, of the Bar Convent, York. With an Introduction by Bishop Hedley. Illustrated. 5s. A Shorter Life, with Two Portraits, and Introduction by ABBOT GASQUET, O.S.B. 2s. net (postage 3d.).

*Miscel-
laneous
Works*

A BISHOP AND HIS FLOCK. By the Rt. Rev. JOHN CUTHBERT HEDLEY, O.S.B., Bishop of Newport. 6/-.

ALTAR SERVER'S MANUAL OF THE ARCH-CONFRATERNITY OF ST. STEPHEN. Compiled by a Priest of the Archdiocese of Westminster. With an Introductory Preface by His Grace the Archbishop of Westminster. Leather. 2/- net (postage 2d.).

ANCIENT CATHOLIC HOMES OF SCOTLAND. By DOM ODO BLUNDELL, O.S.B. With an Introduction by the Hon. Mrs. Maxwell Scott, of Abbotsford. Forty Illustrations. 3/6 net (postage 4d.).

CARMICHAEL, MONTGOMERY.

In Tuscany. New Edition, with numerous Illustrations. Large Cr. 8vo. 6s. net (postage 4d.).
John William Walshe. The Story of a Hidden Life. 5/- net (postage 4d.).

CHRIST, THE CHURCH, AND MAN, with some remarks on a New Apologia for Christianity in relation to the Social Question. By CARDINAL CAPECELATRO, Archbishop of Capua. 2/- net (postage 3d.).

CHURCH AND KINDNESS TO ANIMALS. THE. Condemnation of Bull-fighting; Animals in the Lives and Legends of Saints; A Cloud of Witnesses. Illustrated. 2/6.

ECCLESIA, THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. A Planned Series of Papers by DOM GILBERT DOLAN, O.S.B., FR. BENEDICT ZIMMERMANN, O.D.C., FATHER R. H. BENSON, M.A., DOM JOHN CHAPMAN, O.S.B., DOM J. D. BREEN, O.S.B., A. H. MATHEW, FATHER PETER FINLAY, S.J. Cloth, gilt, 3/6 net (postage 3d.).

FOR MY NAME'S SAKE. From the French of CHAMPOL'S "Sœur Alexandrine." Illustrated by L. D. Symington. 2/6.

FOURTEENTH CENTURY CAROLS. Collected by M. DALGLISH. 1/6 net (postage 2d.).

HOME FOR GOOD. By MOTHER M. LOYOLA. With Frontispiece. 3/6 net (postage 4d.).

The author is so well known that her name is sufficient advertisement for any book on the subject, but this time she has written one she will find it hard to beat. It is advice to girls leaving school to face what is for many, if not the greater number amongst them, the most critical and the most dangerous years of their lives.—*Tablet*.

Miscellaneous
Works
(contd.)

LITTLE ANGELS, a Book of Comfort for Mourning Mothers. By FATHER MATTHEW RUSSELL, S.J. 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

MARRIAGE, DIVORCE, AND MORALITY. By FATHER HENRY C. DAY, S.J. An exposition of Catholic teaching on the most burning question of the hour. Preface by the Bishop of Salford. Cloth, gilt, 1/6 net (postage 2d.).

MODERN PILGRIM'S PROGRESS, A. 3rd Edition. With Introduction by the Very Rev. H. S. Bowden. Preface by Mgr. R. H. Benson. 6/-.

NEW GUIDE TO THE HOLY LAND. With 23 Coloured Maps, and 110 Plans. By FR. BARNABAS MEISTERMANN, O.F.M. 7/6 net (postage 4d.).

NOTES ON THE NEW RUBRICS AND THE USE OF THE NEW PSALTER. By the REV. A. J. HETHERINGTON, of Westminster Cathedral. Cloth, gilt, 1/6 net (postage 2d.).

ON RELIGIOUS WORSHIP, AND SOME DEFECTS IN POPULAR DEVOTION. A Pastoral Warning. By GEREMIA BONOMELLI, Bishop of Cremona. Together with a Letter to the English Translator, R. E. With the Author's Portrait. 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

PRACTICE OF MENTAL PRAYER AND OF PERFECTION according to St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross. In three volumes. Cloth, 430 pages each volume, 3/6 net each (postage 4d. each).

SERVERS MANUAL, THE. By JOHN LOUGHLIN. 1/- net (postage 2d.).

SERVERS MISSAL. A Practical Guide for Serving Boys at Mass. By a Sacristan. 6d.

N.B.—Kindly write for our Prayer Book Catalogue and our Illustrated Catalogue of Church Furniture, Statues, Silver, Articles of Devotion, etc. They are sent post free. The General Catalogue of Catholic Books (200 pages) is also sent post free.

BS
269.
H57
c.1

780459

BS 2695 H57 c.1 C
Hitchcock, George S.
The epistle to the ephesians



Library
Campion College

Campion College - U. of Regina



3 1957 000 173 710